The
FORUM

FEBRUARY 1921

OUR RIGHTS IN PANAMA

By MILES POINDEXTER

THE Panama Canal was constructed by the American people, not as a financial investment, on which direct returns were to be received, but in pursuance of a great policy of state. The advantages which appealed to the judgment and the imagination of our government and people were both military and commercial. As a part of military strategy, it was to give more direct and quicker access of our fleets and transports to the Pacific, and as an aid to commerce, it was to shorten the route and greatly reduce the expense of transportation between the East and the West. It could be readily seen by men of vision that it would solidify the nation and concentrate its power. By its means, the distance in measure of hours and expense, between our States on the Pacific and those on the Atlantic, would be greatly shortened.

Throughout our history, it has been the constant tendency of our state policy, both local and national, to make all public highways free to the use and passage of our people. Our roads and streets are now almost entirely free of tolls, and, although we have spent more than a half a billion of dollars in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, it has never occurred to our government, nor to any political party, to advocate the charging of tolls for their navigation.

But, upon the completion of the greatest of our public works, in the union, by means of the Panama Canal, of the

two great oceans encompassing our domain, a different view seems to have taken possession of the minds of those who have been immediately and directly charged with the operation of the Canal. It is a very narrow view. Apparently forgetting the prime objects of its construction, without which the necessary popular and governmental support would never have been obtained, they have apparently been inclined to look upon it as an enterprise which should support itself, at least, if not return a profit upon the investment, by direct financial returns from the charges to be exacted from those, even our own citizens, who utilize its advantages. The Canal should, and, as commerce develops, will more than support itself. But it can be readily seen that if the idea of immediate financial income from the operation of the canal is made paramount, and our own people compelled to contribute thereto—it will diminish, to a large extent, the real benefits which were expected to accrue from the canal.

To whatever extent a charge is levied upon a ton of freight passing through the Canal, the passage of this freight is retarded and obstructed. It is as though some physical obstruction, making more difficult the passage of the Canal, had been placed in the way, in order to reduce its value as a facility of American commerce.

Another factor which has entered into the disposition of this question has been the natural rivalry of competing transportation systems. For more than a generation the influence of transcontinental railroads was used to retard and prevent the construction of this waterway. The Southern Pacific Railway, as a national transportation system, is only half rail, the other half being lines of ships operated by the railway from its eastern terminus at Galveston to New York. It is quite clear that an easy and cheaper means of transportation between the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts would tend to weaken the position of this system, both as to its rail lines and its water-borne commerce. To a greater extent the all-rail lines between the Pacific and the Atlantic would natur-

ally likewise be affected, and the great Canadian Pacific system has a similar interest.

When the Republican Party in 1912 enacted a law for the free passage of the Canal by American coastwise ships, there was immediately developed a large volume of trade by this route. At that time the railroads and not been congested by the enormous increase of national and international trade which has since taken place, and they became alarmed at this diversion of traffic which they looked upon as their legitimate business.

BEFOGGING EFFECT OF TREATIES

The whole question has been complicated, to some extent, by treaties between the United States and Great Britain.

It is quite a triumph of British diplomacy that partly, at least, through its negotiation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in 1850, and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in 1901, she has come to have, at least at the present stage of the controversy, an interest in the Panama Canal equal with that of the United States, although she has never contributed one dollar towards its construction or maintenance, nor surrendered, nor ever owned, one foot of soil or water within or contiguous to it. This has come about, in the opinion of the writer, not through provisions of the treaties themselves, requiring such a construction, but through the lack of definiteness, on the one hand, in the language of the treaties in the protection of the interests of the United States—and wrong construction given to this language, upon the other hand.

In the beginning of these negotiations the only basis of interest of Great Britain, upon which the whole subsequent superstructure of her claims has been built, was her so-called "protectorate" of the Indians of the Mosquito Coast. This territory had been settled and conquered by Spain. In the early part of the seventeenth century the buccaneers, largely of British extraction, but containing adventurers of various races, established their lawless empire in the Caribbean Sea. When their piratical activities had been largely

suppressed, some of them, and others attracted by them, went into the lumber trade on the coast of Nicaragua and Honduras. They claimed the protection of Great Britain, and in 1848 that power seized the Atlantic terminus of the proposed Nicaraguan Canal. It was alleged in the United States that this was a distinct violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and partly as a result of this agitation and partly through the desire of the United States to secure the proposed route of the canal, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was negotiated. The consideration given by Great Britain in this treaty was the relinquishment of her claims to Greytown, at the mouth of the San Juan River, and this further important and significant agreement, in Article I in the treaty, that she would never "erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume, or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America."

This agreement, of course, if fulfilled by Great Britain, would have avoided the violation of the Monroe Doctrine which discountenanced European colonization in America, and at the same time would have freed from British claims the Atlantic terminus of the proposed canal, but Great Britain did not fulfill the agreement, and so the consideration of the treaty failed. Notwithstanding her agreement just quoted she has colonized and has assumed and exercised dominion over a portion of Central America, two hundred and twenty-five miles long, forty or more miles in width, of great natural resources, which is now called British Honduras, or Belize.

AIMS OF CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY

The purpose of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as stated in the prologue, relates specifically to a "ship canal which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by way of the River San Juan, and either or both of the lakes of Nicaragua, or Managua, to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean."

Article 8, of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, however, contains the following:

> "The Governments of the United States and Great Britain having not only desired, in entering into this convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection by treaty stipulations to any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama. In granting, however, their joint protection to any such canals or railways, as are by this article specified, it is always understood by the United States and Great Britain that the parties constructing or owning the same shall impose no other charges or conditions of traffic thereupon than the aforesaid Governments shall approve of as just and equitable; and that the same canals or railways, being open to the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms, shall also be open on like terms to the citizens and subjects of every other State which is willing to grant thereto such protection as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford."

It will be noted, in the first place, in this Article 8, that the powers making the Treaty "agreed to extend their protection" to the proposed canal or railway. In Article 1 of the Treaty, it was provided:

> "nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess, with any State or Government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other."

In other words the situation contemplated by the Treaty was that of a protectorate by both nations over the canal, on equal terms, and did not contemplate at all a canal to be constructed by one party or the other on its own territory, and by use of its own funds. Furthermore, the agreement of Article 8 was not to fix the status of such canal as it should

be constructed, but it was an agreement to provide for such status by further treaties, the language being as follows: "they hereby argee to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to any other practicable communications," etc.

THE HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY

In the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was superseded, and there for the first time is mentioned a canal to be constructed "under the auspices of the Government of the United States," and that "the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive rights of providing for the regulation and management of the Canal." Still the canal which was contemplated was the proposed Nicaragua canal, it being the intention of the United States, and of those representing them at the time, to construct a canal by this route, and this was so understood. It will be noted, also, that while the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty were abrogated, it still was not contemplated, so far as the canal was concerned, nor any mention made in the treaty of such a plan, that the canal should be constructed upon territory which should be under the sovereign control of the government of the United States; though, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty being superseded, there were no treaty obstacles interfering with the United States acquiring such sovereign control.

Instead of the canal being constructed under the auspices of the United States, under such conditions as were referred to in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, through territory governed by another nation, the United States has acquired full sovereignty over the territory through which the canal was actually constructed. It also acquired the rights of the French Canal Company in the Panama Canal, which it exercised under the concession granted by the United States of Columbia, known as the Wyse Concession, in 1878. At the time we acquired these rights, and long before that, the French Canal Company was engaged in the actual work of construction of the canal, and its rights, both in the construction and

in the government of the Canal after it should have been constructed, were not subject in any way, whatever, to the claims of Great Britain.

In the Cambridge edition (1910) of the "Encyclopedia Britannica," a British publication, p. 495, vol. vi, it is stated: "It seems to be a just conclusion that when in 1852 the Bay Islands were erected into a British 'colony' this was a flagrant infraction of the treaty; that as regards Belize, the American arguments were decidedly stronger and more correct historically."

WHEN TREATIES DO NOT BIND

That a treaty made with reference to well understood conditions, existing at the time of execution of the treaty, is not binding as to entirely different and inconsistent conditions not contemplated by the parties to the treaty, is a very well-known rule of international law.

An American authority, Dr. David Jayne Hill, states:

> "On the other hand, Great Britain, as the greatest of mariaime powers, might profit greatly by the construction of such a canal; and there was the possibility that the United States, whose position in the Western Hemisphere had been profoundly modified in the fifty years that had elapsed since the signing of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, might consider it expedient to denounce that treaty, on the ground that treaties, even when alleged to be perpetual, are morally binding only *rebus sic stantibus,* and cease to be so when conditions have essentially changed."

On the same subject, Dr. Hannis Taylor, a distinguished authority on constitutional law, says:

> "As treaties stand upon a basis of their own, entirely apart from private contracts, the law of nations has always recognized the fact that all such agreements are necessarily made subject to the general understanding that they shall cease to be obligatory so soon as the conditions upon which they were executed are essentially altered.
>
> "The principle that all treaties are concluded upon the tacit condition, *rebus sic stantibus,* clearly recognized by Grotius (ch. 16, sec. 25 *et seq.*) and Vattel (Book 2, ch. 13, sec. 200), has been denied by no modern authority. Hall, the greatest of the recent English publicists, whose book is the vade mecum of the British

foreign office, declares in his work on International Law (sec. 116) that neither party to a treaty 'can make its binding effect dependent at will upon conditions other than those contemplated at the moment when the contract was entered into; and, on the other hand, a contract ceases to be binding so soon as anything which formed an implied condition of its obligatory force at the time of its conclusion is essentially altered.' Mr. Oppenheim, now professor of international law in the University of Cambridge, has, in his great work, volume 1, page 550, section 539, said: 'It is an almost universally recognized fact that vital changes of circumstances may be of such a kind as to justify a party in notifying an unnotifiable treaty. The vast majority of publicists, as well as all the Governments of the members of the family of nations, agree that all treaties are concluded under the tacit condition *rebus sic stantibus.*'

"In my own work on 'International Public Law' (sec. 394) I have stated the matter in this way: 'So unstable are the conditions of international existence, and so difficult is it to enforce a contract between States after the state of facts upon which it was founded has substantially changed, that all such agreements are necessarily made subject to the general understanding that they shall cease to be obligatory so soon as the conditions upon which they were executed are essentially altered'

"Having thus restated the rule, it was not strange, perhaps, that I should have been the first to apply it to the construction of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901, which contemplated the building of an interoceanic canal by the United States in foreign territory. It seems to me that a radical breach of the tacit condition, *rebus sic stantibus,* occurred when, in November, 1903, the Canal Zone became, by purchase, the domestic territory of the United States. It is hard to deny that by that event the tacit condition, *rebus sic stantibus,* was broken; and yet the subject is a delicate one—it should be approached with great calmness, great caution. The existence of the rule, *rebus sic stantibus,* as applied to the construction of treaties, has never been denied, so far as I know, and it is not at all likely that Great Britain will deny its existence in the present instance."

That the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is not applicable, and in the nature of things incapable of application to the actual conditions under which the United States acquired, constructed, and is now controlling the Panama Canal, is admitted by Sir Edward Grey, then foreign minister of Great Britain, who represented her in this controversy.

SIR EDWARD GREY'S OPINION

In the so-called "free-tolls" discussion he said:

> "Rules, 3, 4, and 5 of article 3 of the treaty are taken almost textually from Articles 4, 5, and 6 of the Suez Canal convention of 1888. At the date of the signature of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, the territory on which the Isthmian Canal was to be constructed did not belong to the United States, consequently there was no need to insert in the draft treaty provisions corresponding to those in articles 10 and 13 of the Suez Canal convention, which preserve the sovereign rights of Turkey and of Egypt and stipulate that articles 4 and 5 shall not affect the right of Turkey, as the local sovereign, and of Egypt, within the measure of her autonomy, to take such measures as may be necessary for securing the defense of Egypt and the maintenance of public order, and in the case of Turkey, the defense of her possessions on the Red Sea.
>
> "Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the canal, His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection."

The rules in article 3 of the treaty referred to by Sir Edward Grey provide:

> "3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual or take any stores in the Canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the Canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.
>
> "Prizes shall be, in all respects, subject to the same rules as vessels of war or belligerents.
>
> "4. No belligerents shall embark or disembark munitions of war or warlike materials in the Canal except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.
>
> "5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the Canal within three marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time except in case of distress and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent."

The paragraphs just quoted were a very substantial part of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty but Sir Edward Grey admits

that they are not applicable to the Panama Canal on account of the fact that it was built under conditions entirely different from those which were contemplated and had in mind by the parties to the treaty at the time the treaty was negotiated.

He takes the inconsistent position, however, that though these provisions of the treaty do not apply, such other provisions of the treaty as it may suit the interests of the British government to insist upon, do apply, notwithstanding the fact that these same changed conditions affect these other provisions of the treaty in a like degree as those just quoted.

EQUALITY OF USE IMPOSSIBLE

Of course it would be a mere form, even if insisted upon, for the United States to pay to itself toll charges for the passage of its naval vessels through the Canal and no such charge is made, and it is not contended, of course, by Great Britain that it should be made. And yet Great Britain, with utter inconsistency, takes the position that the treaty requires the United States to charge tolls for the passage of its merchant ships through the Canal. The provisions of the treaty with reference to the passage of merchant ships and naval vessels are exactly the same, as follows: "The Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality."

It is not open and cannot be open on terms of entire equality as between the vessels of the United States and the vessels of other countries by reason of the fact, which is not in controversy at all, that the United States is the owner of the canal and collects the tolls. Whoever the owner and operator of the Canal might be, whether a private corporation, such as that which partly constructed the Canal before it was taken over by the United States, or some nation other than the United States, so long as this owner had charge of the Canal and the use and benefit of any charges made upon commerce passing through it, its own vessels would necessarily have been in a different position from those of others. As a matter of fact the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was not only

not drafted on the assumption that the Canal would be constructed through territory owned by the United States as a sovereign power, but it did not contemplate, by its terms, the construction of the Canal by the United States directly. On the contrary it expressly refers to a canal to be constructed "under the auspices" of the United States. All of these matters were ably presented to the British Government by President Taft and by Secretary of State Knox, with the result that at the time of the enactment of the so-called "free-tolls" Act in 1912, the controversy had been brought to an end and Great Britain had practically ceased to make any contention in regard to it.

The representatives of the United States, Mr. Hay, as Secretary of State and Mr. Choate, as Ambassador to Great Britain, as shown by their official correspondence, seem to have regarded the entire subject in a rather casual way so far as the protection of the interests of the United States was concerned. Mr. Choate wrote:

> "I have not had time to study this question carefully . . . These are only my hasty suggestions, after having Lord Lansdowne's papers in my hands for only two busy days. I told him what I thought because he wanted to know, and I give them to you for what they are worth . . . Upon the whole the prospect of a satisfactory settlement of this troublesome matter seems to me better than it has ever been before."

The principal object here seems to have been to get the "troublesome matter" disposed of, rather than to maintain and establish the rights and interests of this country.

MR. CHOATE'S STRANGE STATEMENT

In fact, Mr. Choate, in one of his letters taken from the publication of the official correspondence, made this strange statement:

> "Lord Lansdowne's object in insisting upon article 3a is to be able to meet the objectors in Parliament by saying that although they have given up the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, they have saved the 'general principle' and have made it immediately effective and binding upon the United States as to all future routes and have dispensed with future 'treaty stipulations'—making it much stronger

> than it was before. I think his all-sufficient answer is that by giving up the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which stood in the way of building any canal, *he has insured the building of a canal for the benefit of Great Britain at the expense of the United States.*"

In fact, events, strange as it may seem, have almost justified this remarkable analysis of the American Ambassador of the result of the treaty. In the London *Times* of December 31, 1913, it is stated: "The canal will be a boon to England. While the United States built it and glories in it, its commercial importance to the United States is a bagatelle as compared to its importance to the world's foreign trade."

Sir Edward Grey, in an official note, declared:

> "The volume of British ships which will use the canal will, in all probability, be very large. Its opening will shorten, by many thousands of miles, the waterways between England and other portions of the British Empire, and if on the one hand it is important to the United States to encourage its mercantile marine and establish competition between coastwise traffic and trans-continental railways, it is equally important to Great Britain to secure to its shipping that just and impartial treatment to which it is entitled by treaty and in return for a promise of which it surrendered the rights which it held under the earlier convention."

It may be mentioned here that while under the early convention it agreed to surrender certain rights, as a matter of fact it violated those conventions, as pointed out above, and that the entire earlier convention was superseded, as to the surrender of these rights, by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which eliminated the entire agreement against British colonization and dominion in the Caribbean.

A further proof of the inapplicability of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to the Panama Canal is contained in the provision adopting the regulations governing the Suez Canal, as the rule of the canal contemplated in the treaty. Of course these rules, as pointed out by Sir Edward Grey, are inapplicable, in the very nature of things, to the United States, as the sovereign of the Panama Canal. The British government is merely a minority stockholder in the corporation owning the Suez Canal, and the regulations adopted in the convention of Constantinople, October 28, 1888, con-

tained express provisions protecting the sovereign rights of Turkey and of Egypt "within the measure of her autonomy." The parties to that convention were Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, and Turkey. As Sir Edward Grey said, similar provision for the protection of the sovereign rights of the United States in the Panama Canal were not inserted in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty because it was not contemplated at that time that the United States was to be in that position.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S INCONSISTENCY

All of the foregoing has been fully recognized by President Wilson and by the Party which he represents. The Democratic platform of 1912 declared: "We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Canal." President Wilson emphasized that demand in a campaign speech to which he gave a special point by assuring his auditors that it was not mere "molasses to catch flies" and yet, without explanation or apology, in 1914 he practically demanded of Congress the repeal of "that provision of the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from the payment of tolls." The message was delivered under peculiar circumstances. As stated above the "free-tolls" provision had been accepted in effect, and the controversy had been concluded, but suddenly the President appeared in person before Congress and delivered to them a message dealing with this subject alone, and in it he did not mention his previous campaign pledges nor those of his party. He used this unprecedented language: "We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity."

This, perhaps, was the first time in the history of any important country where it was successfully proposed by the Chief Executive that rights and policies of the most vital character should be disposed of "without raising the question of whether we were right or wrong." It contained, al-

so, the novel idea and doctrine that the American Government, which under our theory of government is merely a trustee for the people, with limited powers and functions fixed in a written Constitution, had a right to surrender the interests of those people as a matter of "generosity."

There was an air of mystery about the entire matter, and it was intensified by the President's obscure suggestions and vague references to unexplained international situations. In order to give added and powerful force to his appeal to Congress, the President said, "I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure." Notwithstanding the vogue of the Administration for open diplomacy, the President has never yet seen fit to take either Congress or the people into his confidence to the extent of explaining, even in the slightest degree, what these "methods of even greater delicacy or nearer consequence" were; and the question as to what great international emergencies or relations of such "near consequence" and "great delicacy" depended upon the charging of tolls by the United States upon its own vessels passing through the Panama Canal, is to this day a subject of curious surmise. It is known that the question was reopened by Great Britain upon the urgent insistence of the Canadian Premier. The interests of the Canadian Pacific Railroad in putting obstructions in the way of the free use of the Canal was the same as that of the American transcontinental lines.

HAMPERING OUR MERCHANT MARINE

The imposition of $1.20 upon each ton of American freight passing through the Canal is a serious obstacle to the development of an American Merchant marine. The same policy of "generosity" which imposed this burden, has been at the bottom of the internationalist movement which has been the chief issue of American politics for the last two years. It is part and parcel with the policy, advocated

by a member of the Cabinet, of passive surrender to foreign countries in the struggle for the trade of South America on this same plea of altruism; and of the entire movement for the formation of a world republic, with centralized legislative and executive powers, in which there should be no "economic barriers" or discriminations between its several states. The most active instrumentality, backing up the demands of Great Britain in this controversy, was the Carnegie Peace Foundation. The burden of the argument for Great Britain in the Senate of the United States was borne by Senators who were on the Board of Directors of this Carnegie Foundation. The fact has often been overlooked that this institution was founded by a Britisher, and not by an American; and the further and much more significant circumstance was forgotten that Andrew Carnegie—not an American citizen although he had achieved great business success in this country, but a registered voter in Scotland and a subject of Great Britain—was a vigorous public advocate of a return of the United States to a union with that Empire. He looked at things from the British standpoint, and the money, by which was widely distributed literature and propaganda in favor of giving Great Britain equal rights with America in this American canal, was supplied very largely by this Carnegie institution.

In the effort which is favored by most of our people, to develop a merchant fleet under the American flag, no single advantage would be more conducive to its prosperity and success than the free use by our own ships of this great canal, which the vigorous energy and determination of Theodore Roosevelt, and the enterprise and genius of the American people, have provided for the nation without any foreign assistance whatever.

As to the effect of a waterway in cheapening freight rates, it may be noted that when water transportation by the Erie canal was opened in about 1871, the rail rate on wheat from Chicago to New York was 31¢ a bushel. A water rate of 20.24¢ a bushel was established and, through the operation of this influence, in 1912 the rail rate had been reduced

to 9.6¢ a bushel, while the water rate had come down to 5.57¢ a bushel.

In 1911 the State of Washington produced 4,064,754,000 feet of lumber; the State of Oregon produced 1,803,698,000 feet; the State of California produced 1,207,561,000 feet, a total of 7,016,013,000 feet of lumber. The Pacific Coast continues to be the greatest lumber producing section of the Union. This lumber is used very largely in the Mississippi Valley, which is easily reached from the Gulf and the Mississippi River—and on the Atlantic Coast. The trade rival in lumber of the Pacific Coast is British Columbia, carrying lumber in British ships more cheaply than in American ships. This inequality of the cost of operation could be largely equalized by giving to our own ships the free use of our own Canal. The cost of transportation, of course, enters into the cost to the consumer, or ultimate purchaser, and the owners of the cargo of a ship of 10,000 tons, paying tolls of $12,000 for its passage at Panama, must add this cost to the sale price of the cargo. The total burden to the people in the volume of commodities transported both East and West by rail and by water, affected directly and indirectly in multiplied and widening zones, is readily to be seen.

The true policy for the United States is to exercise its sovereign rights, which are denied by no one, and establish a policy with reference to the Panama Canal which will produce the greatest possible benefit to the American people, consistent with fair treatment of foreign nations. No foreign country can object to paying a reasonable rate as a toll for the use of this Canal in order to compensate the American nation, at least in part, for the cost of its maintenance. The enormous burden of its construction can only be repaid to them by its free use by our own ships of commerce and the strategic advantage which it gives to our ships of war.

THE JAPANESE ATTITUDE

By Iichiro Tokutomi

THE Japanese do not wish to be regarded as anti-American. It is the desire of Japan to increase the number of her friends, if even by a single person, and to lessen the number of her enemies. We realize full well that the Anglo-Japanese Alliance has changed in its character, yet we regard it as a valuable alliance and, in fact, a necessary arrangement, and it is not our intention to needlessly abandon it. We in Japan realize that America is regarded as not only the wealthiest but the strongest country in the world and that she is one of the foremost of Nations.

It is foolish, therefore, to suppose that we should go out of our way to make her an enemy, an act that would unquestionably endanger the progress of Japan's development. No Japanese, with a drop of patriotic blood in his veins, desires to plunge his country into trouble with America, much less provoke animosity. It is not too strong to say that if there be such a Japanese, it would not be too harsh to brand him as a traitor to the Japanese Empire. We are not anti-Americans, but at the same time we are not so-called pro-Americans. I would call your attention to what the so-called pro-Americans in Japan have done in the past and what they are doing at present. I do not wish to question or reproach their motives. They may be patriotically planning for the good of the Japanese Empire, but their attitude may be one of catering to America, in a way which is unbecoming as Japanese subjects. They may place themselves, in accepting a rebuke or an anti-Japanese attitude on the part of America, in the manner of one who turns the left cheek when the right has been slapped.

From a moral, so-called Christian point of view their attitude may be regarded as excellent, but judging from the results of such obeisance we can not help but note that the far-reaching harm done by them to the Empire is greater than that done by the anti-Americans in Japan. The pro-Americans in Japan today are people who would suppress unpleasant affairs. They are attempting to hide every circumstance and every fact which is irritating and unpleasant between the two Nations; or, if they can not suppress, at least they attempt to hide the greater part of the perplexing questions and assume the attitude of suppliantly appealing to maintain the friendship between Japan and America.

What is the effect of such an attitude? It only deepens further the American misunderstanding about Japan, and feeds the anti-Japanese fire among Americans which, if continued in, will confuse the friendly relations and plunge them into an abyss from which it will be difficult to restore the comity of the two Nations. The harm done by the pro-Americans in Japan to the cause of friendly relations between the two great Nations is greater than that done by the anti-Americans in Japan.

AMERICA AN ENFANT TERRIBLE

The American is the *enfant terrible* of the world. He displays a spirit that I would compare with that of an aggressive youth. He is prone to assume that the world revolves around his country. He takes the attitude that the Powers of the world exist for America alone, and seems to act as if convinced that America could do no wrong.

If some Americans criticise Japan as being the Prussia of the Orient, our pro-Americans will say, "Yes, indeed! Japan is a militaristic country." If some Americans criticise Japan's continental development, our pro-Americans will say, "Yes, indeed. Japan's imperialism is a curse for her." If some Americans tell that America has done a lasting service in opening up Japan to the world, the pro-Americans will say, "Yes, indeed! Perry was a great benefactor of Japan. So we erected a monument in his memory."

If some Americans expound that America is a land of justice, our pro-Americans will say, "We respect Washington and Lincoln as the modern examples of sages."

Thus the American in Japan is fanned into self-satisfaction and he says to himself, "Japan is repentant of her past wrongs and is fast being Americanized and, if America would exert a little more influence upon Japan, the latter would consider it an honor to regard America as the sun and herself as the moon which lights itself by reflecting a portion of light from the sun." We should not wonder at all if the American jumps at the conclusion, because it is one of the national characteristics of the American to jump at conclusions.

America does not lack in clever persons. The anti-Japanism of the anti-Japanese will not be alleviated by the soft speeches of our pro-Americans. On the contrary it will be stimulated, and the resentment increased. The anti-Japanese will say, "The Japanese are a cunning race. They do not outwardly show their sentiments of gladness, or anger, joy or sorrow. Not only that, they express themselves quite the opposite to their true sentiments. When they laugh, they are crying at heart. When they show they are glad, they are sorry at heart. When they show they are modest and yielding they are haughty at heart. When they kowtow to America, it is because they expect to gain much in future. In that way, they conquered Russia. Unless America is on guard, she will follow the footsteps of Russia. America should never be off her guard in respect of Japan."

Thus the clever Americans will read the words of the pro-Americans in their opposites, and fear and hate Japan, thereby heightening the anti-Japanese sentiment all the more. They will incidentally co-operate with the other Americans who, without questioning, swallow the words of the pro-Americans, thereby stimulating scorn at Japan if not the anti-Japanese sentiment, and help to estrange the true friendship of Japan and America, thereby brewing dangerous fomentations which may drive the two nations into an uncalled for crisis.

That is why I have not joined the ranks of the so-called pro-Americans of today, just as I have not become anti-American.

JAPAN NEITHER PRO- NOR ANTI-AMERICAN

We are not so-called pro-Americans, who put the lid on unpleasant things, nor are we anti-Americans, who counter the anti-Japanese attitude in America with an anti-American attitude in Japan. We only want to call a snowy heron a snowy heron, a cormorant a cormorant, a horse a horse, a deer a deer. We want to review the relations between Japan and America as it is, without adding and subtracting a particle.

Some people talk of misunderstandings between Japan and America. Indeed, there are some misunderstandings. But the misunderstandings are different in quality in Japan than the misunderstandings in America. The American in Japan looking at America paints his country too white. The American here says that Japan is a militaristic nation, a land of the military clique, an enemy of liberalism and not a friend of the principle of humanity. "Look at China," he says, "look at Korea, and, to draw a recent illustration, what is Japan doing in Siberia? Japan is the Germany of the Orient. Her aggrandizement will be a menace to the democracy of the world. For the sake of democracy, it is necessary to punish Japan."

This is not a figment of our imagination. Not only among the special class of Americans whose special business it is to conduct anti-Japanese agitation, but even among the ordinary Americans who have no axe to grind against Japan, nor owe any obligation to this country, seven or eight out of ten are entertaining such views.

But who is responsible for allowing the American to entertain such misunderstandings? The responsibility may rest both with America and Japan. On our side, we may divide the responsibility among three classes: First, those so-called pro-Americans in Japan who always approve everything said or done by the American; second, those who

look at their own country with the eyes of a foreigner and do not understand their own country while living and having their being in Japan and who make it a point to exaggerate the wrongs of their own country in their public expressions, that is, those Japanese who are anti-Japanese; third, those who supply the anti-Japanese Japanese, and anti-Japanese Americans, with such anti-Japanese propaganda. I refer to the so-called statesmen in hiding, or soldiers "in the dressing room," who are important and brave when people are not watching.

AMERICA'S OPINION OF JAPAN

Is it a fault of Americans that they misunderstand Japan, or is it a fault of ourselves? Be that as it may, a majority of Americans, or the greater majority, appear to look upon Japan as an armed devil.

On the other hand, our countrymen regard America as a country which still retains the character of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Our countrymen historically overestimate America. At first, they regarded America as a country to be feared, later on as a country to be loved, and, in the end, as a country to be revered. Already seventy years have about elapsed since the intrusion of Commodore Perry. Yet a majority of our countrymen do not yet understand the true purpose for which Commodore Perry led his fleet to break the long slumber of our countrymen. They interpreted America much better than she is, and the interpretation has continued to be traditionally entertained unto the present day. If today our countrymen do not understand some of the doings of America, they generally interpret those doings with well meaning, saying that they are the doings of a very few anti-Japanese Americans. Thus they cannot probe into the truth of the Japanese-American relations, nor do they seem to wish to do so.

In short, the strong advantage which America has over Japan is not her great navy, nor her prosperity and wealth, nor her ability to furnish raw materials to us and to meet us with her inexhaustible purchasing power. We should as-

cribe the advantage of America to the fact that naturally and historically the good will and friendly sentiments have been overwhelmingly entertained toward America generally by our countrymen. To judge by natural tendency, our countrymen may without fear of contradiction be said to be by birth pro-Americans—without the adjective "so-called."

Thus America conceives Japan to be far worse than she really is. Japan regards America far better than she really is. Both misunderstand. But the directions are diametrically opposite to each other. Yet these misunderstandings cause Japan and America to suffer.

The first prerequisite for the Japanese in formulating our policy toward America is to know what sort of a country America is today. It is important that we should first know America. The trouble of our compatriots today is that they do not take pains to know the truth about our neighbor.

SHINING HORDE

By BARBARA HOLLIS

ONLY the need of you, nightly new-born,
Only the longing that comes with the light;
Only the mantle of hope, ever worn—
These are my treasures: my right.

Only the peace that a memory brings,
Only the faith that the future will hold
Joys worth the waiting for—these are the things
Better, more lasting, than gold!

RESTORING WORLD PROSPERITY

By JOHN MCHUGH

IN an economic sense, one of the most notable consequences of the great war was the lifting of the mantle of world leadership in finance from European shoulders to our own. Prior to the outbreak of the war in 1914, we were a debtor to the rest of the world to the extent of approximately four billions of dollars. Out of the earnings of our railroads, mills and factories, we sent abroad each year upward of two hundred millions of dollars in the settlement of interest and in payment of dividends.

We practically depended upon London to finance such foreign trade as we then had. The pound sterling was the currency of international commerce. Our great Stock Exchanges and Boards of Trade were merely national in their scope. We had no co-ordinated banking system. We had no discount market, nor even the machinery for developing one. More self-contained than any other single nation, we allowed our foreign trade to shift for itself. We imagined that sales abroad were not vitally necessary, and that domestic demands would absorb all that we produced. We organized no machinery to finance export sales in a sound, orderly, systematic way.

Europe was the center of world-finance when the war broke out in 1914. Then the state of affairs changed dramatically. Europe turned to us. The Allies desperately needed food-stuffs, munitions and manufactured materials, and bought them in our markets. They could not spare us goods in return, so began paying gold; then they sold back to us our own securities; and later borrowed on Government credit. Having sold in haste we financed our exports in haste;

credit was extended to each particular case in the way that met with least resistance.

When we entered the war in April, 1917, we had already practically wiped out our debt abroad. As active belligerents we went on shipping the products of our farms and the output of our factories to Europe on an even greater scale, and stimulated our production and expanded our industrial plants to enable us to do so. Our Government financed the purchases of Europe by extending loans abroad aggregating nearly ten billions of dollars. Shortly after the close of the war, loans on the part of our Government to other governments ceased, but contrary to many expectations the great demand for our goods continued. The result was that foreign trade continued to be financed in numerous supposedly short-term ways—by the purchase of foreign exchange bills, by extensions of credit from exporters here to their foreign customers, (often followed by borrowing at the banks to meet the shortage of working capital thus brought about,) and in other ways which need not be described in detail.

EUROPE'S DEBT TO US HELPFUL

It is estimated that the floating debt of foreign countries to ourselves, thus created, has now reached almost $4,000,000,000. The creation of this great debt has served one purpose. It has enabled our foreign trade to go on. It has brought our total of loans to foreigners to $15,000,000,000, and enabled us to assume the place of the leading creditor nation of the world.

But in extending short-term credits to finance exports during 1919 and 1920, we as a people did not stop to the total effect on our business and financial structure. These credits were called "short-term" but really were not. They could not be shifted about within the country, but so long as our exports exceeded our imports, and so long as people abroad could not meet their obligations with goods, gold or investment loans, they could not be paid off. Thus it is seen that $4,000,000,000 of floating credit, extended to facilitate our export trade, has been one of the leading factors in

bringing about the credit stringency in the United States, and that stringency, in turn, has been one large factor contributing to the recent violent decline in commodity prices.

No one will maintain that it has ever been a proper function of commercial banks to finance a relatively permanent one-sided balance of trade. Because, however, they have been drawn by circumstances into doing this, and because our banking machinery until recently supplied no adequate remedy for the situation that consequently arose, the commercial banks have been brought virtually to the end of their ability to supply further credit in the export field, and unless a remedy is found our export trade must be severely curtailed.

NEGLECTFUL OF OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

The acknowledged lack of adequate banking and credit machinery to finance our foreign commerce and at the same time take every proper care of our tremendous domestic needs, suggests that we of this Nation have been somewhat neglectful of our responsibilities. We find ourselves today in a state of affairs which grew inevitably out of conditions prevailing in the last two years. For the year and a half following the Armistice we were lifted on a great wave of what we called prosperity. Prices and wages were high and rising higher. Spending at home was generous and unstinted. Other nations bought our goods as never before—in fact, measured by values, we sold more goods abroad during that year and a half than we did during any period of Europe's desperate war period.

Conditions are now changed. Our extraordinary prosperity has stopped. Factories and mills have shortened their hours of work; many even have closed down. As for prices, these have fallen sharply; in the last half year wholesale prices on an average have dropped twenty-five per cent.

Goods prepared for export have backed up at all our seaports owing to ineffectual means to finance their shipments, and our markets are glutted in consequence. Yet the irony of it all is that the outside world could use all the surplus

products we might spare, and Europe is still calling urgently for our goods and for our aid.

In order to establish commercial relations among the nations of the world and to revive industry on a sound and profitable basis, international credit must be utilized in the coming year on the broadest possible lines, and under the wisest possible direction. Foreign buyers who are not in a position to pay cash for more than a small percentage of the American purchases, have not found the means available for securing proper credit, in the numerous cases where that credit is warranted.

Credit is absolutely essential to the support and development of the foreign trade of the United States. Whether the English, French, Italian, German, South African, Australian, Japanese or Chinese buyers of American goods meet their purchases within a period of three months or three years is, after all, a matter of practice rather than of principle, and it is in recognition of this that American financial thought is devoting itself to meet the needs of the situation. Commercial banks in the United States until recently financed the country's gigantic foreign trade, following their accustomed habits of extending their facilities in the form of short-term credits. When these credits matured they were renewed, and renewals and extensions of these credits have multiplied so far that recently the commercial banks of the country approached very closely to the point beyond which they could not go under the law, in the matter of extending loans, without impairing the statutory reserve limit of the discount banks of the Federal Reserve System.

Now, there is absolutely no reason to question the integrity of the European, South African, Australian, and Oriental buyers of American products, the renewal of whose obligations has resulted in the "freezing" of a large amount of credits among the bankers throughout the United States. But these credits, owing to the laws and business customs which demand that commercial bank resources be kept liquid in order to meet whatever demands may be made upon them, cannot be materially increased, hence the recent

slackening of foreign purchases in the United States and the consequent shrinkage of the export movement from our seaports to the markets of the world.

UNIQUE PLAN TO AID FOREIGN TRADE

It is to meet the situation that faces the United States squarely, and to solve the situation as it relates to the matter of foreign trade credits, that, with the help of banks and business enterprises in every part of the United States, the Foreign Trade Financing Corporation is being organized. It should be a matter of interest to people everywhere to consider the unique manner in which this Corporation is being brought into existence. A certain number of far-seeing men recognized as long ago as 1918 whither we were drifting. In the fall of that year—before the Armistice was signed—a resolution was adopted at the annual convention of the American Bankers Association declaring that the Association

> "Pledges itself to support by every means in its power the development of export trade, to encourage manufacturers to enter upon this field of distribution, and to provide, as rapidly as possible, adequate facilities for financing export operations sufficient to meet every reasonable demand that may arise."

The appointment of a Commerce and Marine Committee made up of bankers representative of all parts of the country was the direct and immediate result of the adoption of that resolution. This Committee, specifically charged with the study of this important question and with bringing the results of that study before the Association, felt that it had a particular function to perform, and proceeded to apply its best efforts to it.

There is no need to detail all the activities of the Committee. Suffice it to say that as a result of its activities the proposal was made to the banks and business enterprises of the United States that a corporation with $100,000,000 capital be formed, the purpose of which should be the sale to the American people of debentures, the proceeds to be devoted to the promotion of the country's foreign trade. As a result

of this Committee's activities, together with the co-operation of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Foreign Trade Council, a convention was held at Chicago, shortly before Christmas, and the proposed corporation was there and then definitely launched, to conduct its operations under the authority of the so-called Edge Act.

This Act, which gives the authority to organize such a corporation as contemplated, is an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act. It provides that corporations may extend loans abroad and issue debentures against these loans to the extent of ten times their capital and surplus. National banks are authorized to invest in the stock of such individual corporations, and in many cases the State laws permit the State banks to invest a certain percentage of their capital in their stock.

IMPORTANT EFFECTS OF EDGE ACT

In its potential effect upon the business of the United States, the Edge Act was probably the most important piece of legislation since the Federal Reserve Act itself. It may fitly be compared with that measure. Like the Federal Reserve Banks, Edge corporations are placed under the control of the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Act unified our banking system; the Edge Act makes possible the unification of our foreign trade financing. The Federal Reserve System made possible a great extension of banking credit; the Edge Act makes possible a great extension of investment credit. What the Federal Reserve Act has done in accomplishing its purpose at home the Edge Act makes possible in financing our merchants in their commerce abroad. The banks of the country subscribed the capital stock of the Federal Reserve Banks, and with capital of approximately $100,000,000, the Federal Reserve Banks now report $1,700,000,000 in deposits, and $2,700,000,000 in discounts. Edge corporations can likewise extend credits to many times their capital and surplus.

In its permanent influence for good, we have great hopes in this corporation. It will be sufficiently large to issue $1,-

000,000,000 of debentures in the interest of America's trade development and in the interest of oversea buyers whose credit is perfectly good but who require greater time for repayment of advances than ninety days or six months. The corporation will be modelled, after a fashion, in the mold of the European investment trusts that have been so extraordinarily helpful in the upholding of trade relations among other countries than our own. By reason of its large capital, it is felt that the corporation now being organized will have every possible advantage in its field of work. It will attract the best expert talent. It will have the efficiency attaching to large organizations. It will give the utmost protection to the investor. It will be better able to encourage thrift. It will give to every locality the fullest possible use of the capital and funds coming out of that locality. It will claim the highest degree of public confidence at home, and by virtue of its prestige and position will exert a certain and commanding position abroad.

TWO ESSENTIALS OF PROSPERITY

It is important that we keep in mind, in all that we say and do in the period of the world's reconstruction, those two essentials of real prosperity, thrift and production. Without these thoroughly inculcated into the American people, America's future as a creditor nation will not be at all as secure as we would have it. The success of the corporation is based upon these two essentials; upon thrift, in order that a part of the savings of the American people may be used to finance foreign trade and thus sustain prosperity; and production, in order that America may spare the means of supplying foreign markets without subjecting the people to increased prices for their own needs.

This plan does not suggest inflation. Of that we have had enough. Nor does it suggest the absorption of existing credit. What it does suggest is the setting aside, through the exercise of sane economy, of a reasonable percentage of America's great annual production of wealth, estimated at seventy billions of dollars. It suggests the investment of that

reasonable percentage in securities growing out of foreign trade.

In considering the future activities of this corporation it is not contemplated that Americans, as a people, shall go on indefinitely selling to the outside world more than they buy from it, and indefinitely increasing loans to the world in the meanwhile. That cannot happen in any case. Ultimately, as the annual interest due on outstanding credit grows, other nations, in paying it, will send more goods to the United States than it sends them. But what is contemplated is that as a people Americans desire to maintain their export trade on sound principles, avoiding any sudden changes that might have disastrous consequences.

Before closing, there is one thought that should be touched upon; namely, that of the strength of the people to whom future credit may be extended in the advancing of foreign trade. It is our suggestion that the scope of the corporation shall be literally world-wide; that the activities shall profitably expand in whatever direction sound principles dictate. That means, of course, every country in the world where we can with safety and benefit sell American goods.

Only as we face the situation that is before us boldly, will we seize our present opportunity to maintain our foreign trade, preserve our prosperity, and mitigate our present depression. Only so we can take our full part in meeting our present responsibilities to the world.

THE NEED FOR AN ACTOR-MANAGER

By JOHN E. KELLERD

THE art of acting is the most subtle and rarest of accomplishments. It is also strangely elusive, for it is based upon the science of the human mind and body, and is the art of its expression. It requires, therefore an exquisite mentality, comprehensive and all-embracing, complemented by an imagination fully developed and firmly controlled.

In the drama of the day we have simple and undeniable evidence of the extent of this accomplishment and of its shortcomings. It is but natural that the blame for these shortcomings should be denied by each contributing element, and placed always on somebody else. The manager complains that the actor is inadequate, and the actor responds that the manager is ignorant and knows nothing of art. Let us endeavor to arrive, in the conclusion, at some sort of decision as to how far each of these opinions is justified by the facts.

It is generally admitted that the possession of anything implies a concomitant obligation. Life itself is an obligation, and to be justified must be used for the betterment of mankind, contigent, of course, upon the capacity of the individual. It should therefore follow that a talent for acting, which is the only justification for embracing the actor's calling, also implies the obligation that, possessing that talent, it must be used to its utmost to fulfil the proper function of the actor, which is to stimulate and improve the mental and moral status of his audience.

Unfortunately for the function of the drama, in many cases a taste for acting is mistaken for a talent. It is no betrayal of the exact truth to say that every young woman

who studies the Shakespearean heroines, under the tutelage of an elocution teacher, believes sincerely even though not asserted, that she could play the rôles very much more successfully than the actresses who play them in the theatres. This amazing belief, which is not confined to the student alone, but is shared by many otherwise intelligent people, will, perhaps, faintly suggest how little appreciated is the art itself by those who make up the supply of aspirants from whom the stage receives its raw material.

Once across the back door of a theatre, the aspirant feels that that alone transforms him from a layman into an actor. The development consists in following the stage directions of whoever is in charge of the putting on of the play, and the conscious or unconscious absorbing of the stage habits of those with whom he happens to be thrown in contact. If the beginner commences his career in a stock company, he will find that one and sometimes two plays a week are rehearsed and performed—usually one in the better class of stock companies. As there are several matinees during the week, and one day off for study, there are, perhaps, taken altogether, from three to four entire rehearsals; the actor has barely time to memorize the lines, even in the most inaccurate way, has no real knowledge of the underlying meaning of the play, and confines himself to locating his positions, fastening the "cues" in his mind, and performing such occasional pieces of stage "business" as are known to belong to the play—the work having been a "production" originally—and, for the rest, adjusting his conduct throughout on his momentary impulse as the play goes along.

AVERAGE MANAGER EASILY SATISFIED

This so-called training is regarded as the best school for young actors that the theatre affords. Having no ideal standard of physical expression—a subject never mentioned, and the existence of which is evidently not even suspected—of ideal speech, and the constant training and intelligence which any improvement in this direction demands, it is a fatality that the only quality acquired is a stage habit or man-

ner, which makes proper dramatic expression forever hopeless. This sort of thing is accepted, as a matter of course, by the manager—who doesn't suspect that any other method can exist—as acting; and the quality of the plays produced only adds to the general confusion. Lacking ideality in all concerned in the work, the plays and performances are of the commonplace, relieved here and there by moments of suspense and startling occurrences. The suspensive interest is usually created by danger to the moral (sexual) reputation or physical well-being of one or other of the characters involved, calculated to give the actor an opportunity to perpetrate an exhibition of physical excitement or an obvious appeal for pity. This is looked upon by all concerned as a dramatic scene, and is considered to be as necessary to the average play as the scenery and the theatre itself.

If one is observant, a vast difference will be noted in the mental attitude of any important gathering of people brought together for a distinct purpose. A large number of stockholders in a corporation, a crowded hall to hear a political speech, a congregation in a church, an audience in a theatre—all bring with them, quite unconsciously, a different state of mind and heart. The first two mentioned do not differ essentially, for while the stockholders are impelled by a desire to know something concerning a material advantage, the attendants at the political meeting are really actuated by something of the same motive. The congregation differs vastly from both, in that it seeks consolation of the spirit. The audience differs from them all in that its attitude is brimful of a love for and interest in the well-being of mankind. As to which of these bodies of people represents the happiest state it is superfluous to mention. No other body of people can compare with them in their readiness, and their earnest desire that their ideality may be satisfied; and it is to a body of people in this state of mind and heart that the theatrical producer must creditably acquit himself.

He protests that he gives the public what it wants. Does he? In the same breath he will tell you that trying to find

out what the public wants is not a matter of judgment but one of unadulterated hazard. The truth is that the average manager produces something which he thinks resembles something else which has succeeded in drawing money from the public, and upon this mode of reasoning, if reasoning it is, and upon no other method whatever, he puts forth his wares. Like the great body of mankind, he has not learned to think for himself, and, what is worse, cannot comprehend anything beyond his own comprehension. If one desires to purchase a piano—if one wishes to select a painting for one's drawing-room, it would be a woeful blunder to entrust the selection to one who knows nothing of music or of pictures, yet the mental and artistic status of managers, as a class, is far below that of the great body of the public whose needs they pretend to supply.

Human beings are slaves to habit. It is quite rational that this should be so, for it is, in the main, designed for convenience, comfort, and the general well-being. But all habits have not these qualities to commend them. Many a man, in the habit, for instance, of putting on the left shoe first, has, when in a hurry, picked up the right, thrown it aside, and looked for the left thus wasting the very time he was endeavoring to save. Here habit is stronger than reason, the man knows that fact, but habit prevails. Another outstanding feature of human nature is that it is a slave to imitation. The purchase of a hat is, oftener than not, decided by "this is the style this summer," or "we are selling a great many of these." Now when God made man he did as with the leaves of the field: he made no two alike; and a hat that will become one man will not become another; but this consideration is set aside—not because men do not realize, but that they have not, as a body, learned to think for themselves. This argument especially holds true where a question of taste or beauty arises. Women, in this respect, resemble men. "They are wearing these," has always been a potent cry. The comparison might be pursued indefinitely. But a far more important instance of the prevalence of humans for imitation is that the manner of performing

actions, important and unimportant, the pronunciation of words, the carriage of the body, and so on *ad infinitum,* is mentally fulminated in imitation of somebody else.

ACTORS CREATURES OF HABIT

So with the actor. Like the great body of the people, he is a creature of habit, he is imitative, and he does not think for himself; and this is as true of his efforts on the stage as it is of his personal life.

The art of the actor is to perfect, as nearly as possible, the two elements that go to make up his means of expression—the body and the voice. Be it remembered that the body, at all moments and in every attitude, is constantly expressing something. Unless the control of every part of the body is mastered, the actor will not only fail to express that which he should, but he will, unavoidably, be expressing something else. The neglect of this accomplishment is seen in "mannerisms" of carriage and movement, and these *gaucheries* are a major part of what is regarded nowadays as the actors "personality"—certainly a rather polite way of putting it. A few fortunate men have been endowed with an almost perfect carriage and movement; but, strange as it may appear to the layman, the moment of appearance before the footlights always, in a greater or lesser degree, neutralizes this. It should be remembered than an actor is given some words on a piece of paper, and out of this he must conceive and construct a consistent, meaningful character; for his work is to impersonate what the author has created, and unless he succeeds in impersonating he fails. Shaw writes, recently, of the fact that Sir Herbert Tree never accomplished what he terms a "classical technique," and that, as a consequence, he always presented a version of his own personality, and not the character the author had created. He attributes this to the fact that in Tree's novitiate he had not the advantage of acquiring the art which would make his symbols true, and regrets the absence of any school at the time which might have guided him; for teaching is guidance after all. He speaks of Sir

Henry Irving in the same way. Unquestionably his criticism is just, and would no doubt apply to the great body of people who follow the dramatic stage as a business.

The great mass speak, of course, very imperfectly. You may call upon a hundred people, and when you are invited to take a chair, it will invariably be accompanied by the word "Sidown!" A mere trifle you will say; but as most of our language is spoken that way—I mean by the ignoring of a somewhat similar sound when in close juxtaposition, and as the actor does the same thing, how is the audience to understand what is being said? One will say that is soon and easily remedied. There was never a greater mistake, for the first principle of correct speaking is to be able to speak every word separate from its neighbor. And this must be done *naturally*. If the development of the diaphragm is not such as will enable one to control one's breath as dexterously as a grand-opera prima donna, it cannot be done at all, for it is this development that is the very root and foundation of good speech. How otherwise can a perfect onomatopoea be attained? It is well to remember that the language may be said to be divided into two classes of words; the meaningful and the unmeaningful. In the first group is found the verbs, common nouns, adjectives, exclamation, adverbs and the participles. In the second group the articles, conjunctions, prepositions and the proper nouns. It is just as hurtful and incorrect to saddle an expression on the latter group of words as it is to fail to express the full meaning—with judgment and good taste, of course—of the words of the former group. How can this be done without a developed breath control and an intelligence cultivated to an appreciation of these facts?

My one regret in writing this somewhat fugitive article is that it is practically impossible to convey on paper anything like a clear idea of the immensity of this subject and all its ramification. The proper place would be, of course, the platform.

HAVOC WROUGHT BY BLANK VERSE

It is astonishing how much havoc has been wrought by

the use of the term "blank verse." All actors will agree that it must be spoken differently from the ordinary prose of the modern play. "You must speak it like verse, of course" A most accomplished writer and thinker, holding the chair of dramatic literature in one of our larger universities, recently wrote that "the actor must observe the convention of the blank verse." He meant the same thing as the actor did. What verse? What convention? To allow any meaning to these expressions would argue a regularity or rhythm of which no intelligent writer of "blank verse" would ever be guilty. Did Shakespeare write in regular rhythm? The custom of the actor, especially in the days when this class of play was more frequently performed, was to restrict every line to a regular rhythm, and this he did by a process of emphasizing words which should not have been emphasized, and mispronouncing others that stood in the way. It is no concern of human speech that one word is an anapest, another phrase a dactyl. Amphibrachs and tribrachs might just as well be called a pudding as anything else. I grant they have a place in studying versification, but not in blank verse.

Is the first line of Hamlet's famous soliloquy a series of iambics with hypermetre, or is it composed of trochaic feet with an added syllable at the beginning? According to the pedagogue it is both, so you may take your choice. But what is the value of a technical name for anything when it can be correctly called something else? Is it not the first principle of language that a word is created because it is the only one that will express the meaning? In endeavoring to show that he quite understands blank verse, and how to speak it, the actor gropes about, ashamed to confess his ignorance, and ends up by adopting an unnatural method, which destroys the very beauty he is usually anxious to attain. Teachers in colleges and universities—and out of them—are principally to blame for all this. (I mind me of a distinguished educator who recently told me that "Cyrano de Bergerac" was written in rhymed couplets!) Now a verse is neither a stanza, nor a couplet: It is a line, *verro,* I turn; and the

word "blank" means that one line does not rhyme with another: and out of these simple facts a bugaboo has been created for the actor which makes him unhappy whenever he is called upon to do classical work. Blank verse is a negative expression—it means the absence of something. By what process of reasoning is one called upon to speak it in a special way? There is but one way to speak "blank verse" or anything else, and that is to speak good English; to learn to phrase, and to psychologize the length of pause between every fact, and every qualifying fact, with so delicately true an appreciation that it conveys the sense to perfection.

BORN GENIUSES A MYTH

The conclusion is that Heaven-born geniuses are a myth. Actors are no fonder of thinking hard and laboring hard than any other set of humans. The manager, seeing that there doesn't appear to be very much difference in their calibre, has taken to selecting them by their physical appearance. The actor is the cause, and the manager is the result. The public is quick to respond to really fine acting—that is what fine acting is for: if it doesn't make the public respond it isn't fine acting. You often hear it said that the public doesn't want art. It would be just as sensible for a man to take a broken watch to be mended, state his wants to the watch-repairer, and then add that he mustn't employ any skill in the operation! For what is art in its practice? It is skill—accomplishment.

A few years ago a number of gentlemen of means undertook to establish an ideal theatre. They had money, they were willing to spend it, and both their ideal and their zeal were most commendable. But there was one element lacking in these worthy men; it is certain that they did not say to themselves "If we do not succeed, we will damage the appreciation of the ideal to the same degree in which we aim to accomplish it." When a man wishes to become a soldier he submits to an examination; when one applies for a position as teacher in a school an examination too, must be under-

gone. One must prove one's capacity, whenever the physical, mental or moral good of the community is concerned. Despite some belief to the contrary, there are a few artists who might have been called upon, who, filled with devotion, would gladly have submitted to a thorough examination of their qualifications, and, of their own impulse, would have demonstrated such qualifications. It was not essential that these directors should understand the art—their general education and intelligence, under such a circumstance, would guide them. But this was not done. It was treated as a fashionable toy. Fashions change, and the bright new toy of to-day reposes in the ash-can of to-morrow.

If there is to be a theatre in the metropolis worthy of the name, it will spring from the ideal mind and heart of some half-starved player, who will be a master of the art, a man of personal integrity, of clean wholesome habits, and of real education. When such a man appears upon the horizon the theatre will be found, and the most valuable of the arts will find loyal and constant public support.

Shadow-Man

By JOHN R. C. PEYTON

OLD Death,
He is a shadow-man,
He wanders the dark ways,
Longing to hear of life
Touching people on the shoulders
And leading them off
To the Land of the Shadows.
Greedily

He listens to their stories—
(the adventure of Life
Is a wonderful thing to Death.)
Then he slinks away
And hunts for other people.
Pitiful old Death!

THE TENDENCY OF MODERN OPERA

By E. Jerome Hart

PRACTICALLY all the arts are enlisted in grand opera, and next to music the most important is drama. Indeed, Wagner in his "Opera and Drama" laid down as the foundation of his reforms the principle that the radical error of opera had always been in making musical effect the end and drama the means; whereas he contended that in true music drama the dramatic and poetic element should be the end and music the means.

Before taking note of recent productions by the Metropolitan and Chicago opera companies, and seeing to what extent they indicate progress or stagnation, it is as well to consider the origin and developments of opera. The accepted form of opera had its origin in Italy; in Florence, to be precise, towards the end of the sixteenth century. Its initial tendencies were towards the dramatic and declamatory, and indicated a revolt from the growing practice in the church choirs of obscuring the text of the liturgy by harmonic intricacies, in which a word or syllable was extended over a lengthy and involved musical passage until its sense was almost lost. Inasmuch as the church was unwilling to accept reforms in this direction, there was a secular movement. A method was invented which took the form of musical declamation, in which the singing voice brought the text into greater relief, care being taken to avoid whatever would interfere with the concentration of the auditors upon the words and action.

Here clearly was the germ of the Wagnerian idea or conception of music drama. But after a time Italian com-

posers fell away from grace, and encouraged the singers, who more and more asserted their claims to prominence. Melody dominated verse, sound was preferred to sense, and from the simple *stile parlante* was developed what one writer has referred to as "an outburst of ecstatic song," not only in the opera houses, but also in the churches, that fairly intoxicated the gay world of Europe. Italian composers and their imitators sprang up all over the European continent, extending even to Russia, which by and by was to produce its own school of opera.

This sort of thing, while admired by many was condemned and derided by some, who maintained that opera in its then accepted form was hollow, pretentious and inartistic. French opera, a school which came into existence about three generations after the Italian, was founded on more rational and artistic lines, although it had its own artificialities and inanities. But it gave opportunities for musical declamation and for the due articulation and emphasis of the word, while chorus and dance were imported into the artistic scheme. Meanwhile Haendel in England was turning from the writing of Italian opera to oratorio, in which noble words, sometimes drawn from the sacred Scriptures, sometimes from the great poets, were set to correspondingly noble music, and the two components of song became coequal. Gluck was another reformer, and, anticipating Wagner by nearly a hundred years, in his preface to "Alceste," he sought to restore operatic music to its proper function, that of seconding poetry by enforcing its sentiment and adding to its dramatic purport, without interrupting the situation or delaying and weakening it by superfluous ornament.

The influence of these principles was far-reaching, and their best exemplification was to be found in one or two of Mozart's later operas; while Beethoven himself did not scorn operatic composition, and wrote "Fidelio," an inspired work, in which a noble theme, that of wifely devotion, is nobly treated. Later came Weber, with his operas "Der Freischütz," "Euryanthe" and "Oberon," the last,

incidentally, having been superbly revived at the Metropolitan Opera House last season, additionally proving its imperishability as a work of art. Then also there were Spohr and a few French composers, notably Cherubini, Spontini and Méhul, with, in lesser degree, Meyerbeer, all of whom adhered to Gluck's principles; until at length came the great reformer, Wagner himself.

A REACTION IN ITALY

Meanwhile, however, there had been revulsion and reaction in the original home or birthplace of opera, and in the first half of last century Rossini, Bellini, Donizetti and the young Verdi had reverted to the old forms of elaborate and ornamented aria, in deference to the imperious demands of singers and public, and in the attempt to maintain the glories of the *bel canto* school of vocalism. But while they too often sacrificed poetic values and dramatic effect for the sake of pleasing sound and vocal display, one or two of them, notably Verdi, endeavored to effect a compromise, and imparted to a good deal of their music dramatic meaning as well as sensuous charm. It is interesting to note that some of these works survive, and remain among the most popular in the repertory. But the old Italian superstition that the chief requirements of opera are melody and vocal *tours de force* dies hard, and by the majority musical sound is still preferred to poetic sense.

Stimulated largely by Wagner, Verdi in his later years cut himself loose from the stereotyped forms which he himself had done so much to popularise. So also did Boito, a musical as well as poetic genius, who has never been accepted at his due value in his own country. His "Mefistofele," recently revived with much magnificence at the Metropolitan Opera, is a work conceived on the loftiest lines. Here a great dramatic poem has been moulded into operatic form with fine imaginativeness, Boito, like Wagner, being his own librettist. The prologue, in which Mefistofele from the regions of space defies the Ruler of the Universe, an angelic chorus singing the Creator's praise,

is one of the boldest conceptions and highest achievements in opera. Nor does Boito, any more than Wagner, deny himself the right to indulge in flowing melodies when they are suitable to the situation or sentiment of the scene. But these melodies never hold up or distract attention from the poem or drama.

Nevertheless the Italians have been the last to accept "Mefistofele" as a master work of a master mind. Nor are they much better disposed towards Montemezzi, who, in "L'Amore dei Tre Re," has written a music drama of singular significance as well as rare beauty. In this work Montemezzi adheres to the Wagner principle of music drama; and he does so equally in his opera "La Nave," heard in Chicago last season, but not yet in New York. While he rarely if ever deprives the poetic word and dramatic situation of their importance, the orchestra is paramount. "La Nave," in fact, may be described as a symphony with operatic and dramatic episodes. In "L'Amore dei Tre Re," the composer has taken a great poem—a tense drama culminating in tragedy—and set it to music of the richest and most fervent character and quality. The opera moves along like Greek tragedy, steadily and strongly, gathering intensity and force, the music never hindering the story, but, on the contrary, aiding and strengthening it. Here if anywhere in opera is realized the Wagnerian theory that the poetic element is the end and the music the means. But the Italians, I repeat, are no more enthusiastic over Montemezzi than they are over Boito, and prefer the excessively fluent and sometimes dramatically meaningless Puccini. Incidentally the latter in his Trittico—as his last three short operas have come to be known—seems to have abandoned his old style, and only succeeds in being dull.

WAGNERIAN OPERA COMING BACK

It is superfluous to consider the position of Wagnerian opera at any length. Temporarily displaced by the feelings engendered by the war, it is coming back to its rightful position, and is again supplying one of the great musical

needs of the community. Unfortunately it is found necessary at the Metropolitan Opera House to sing Wagner's operas in a language in which they were not written, and the result is something which is neither German nor English, the English-speaking singers being usually the most unintelligible. "Parsifal" and "Tristan," the only two Wagner operas so far revived at the Metropolitan, are scarcely satisfactory in certain other respects, particularly the scenery. Mr. Urban, who can be finely imaginative, would have done better had he held closer to the Bayreuth models and traditions. However, we must be grateful for limited mercies. We cannot do without our Wagner, although care should be taken not to overdo him, for we cannot help remembering the insidious manner in which the Wagner operas were used as propaganda. But when all is said, as that brilliant musical writer Mr. Paul Rosenfield puts it, Wagner's music comes to men "as the sound of their own voices. . . . It is the common, the universal tongue."

Admirable as are the achievements of the Metropolitan Opera—and Gatti-Casazza has made it superior to La Scala and Covent Garden at their best—there is cause for disappointment over its failure to produce some of the finest works in the Russian operatic repertory. The success of "Boris Godunov" and "Le Coq d'Or" should have encouraged the addition of at least one Russian work to the limited number of novelties during the current operatic season. Last season, certainly, Tschaikowsky's "Eugene Onégin" was revived with indifferent success, which is hardly to be wondered at. The work is excessively sentimental, not to say lugubrious; and, like so much of Tschaikowsky's work, the music for the most part is not typically Russian. Tschaikowsky was not a nationalist in music; he was an internationalist, and although "Eugene Onégin" is comparatively free from ordinary operatic banalities, it might have been written by a western European mindful of the old traditions. It might be suggested that the Metropolitan would do itself high credit and also satisfy public

taste were it to review, say, Borodin's "Prince Igor," Moussorgsky's "Khovantchina," or Rimsky-Korsakoff's "Ivan the Terrible," "The Snow Maiden," or his "Sadko." These are all admirable examples of the Russian school, and the success of "Boris" and "The Golden Cock" sufficiently demonstrates the tendency of modern audiences towards works calling for the exercise of their imaginations, and stimulating their profounder emotions.

THE WAR'S EFFECT

It was not to be expected that there would be much operatic fertility during the war. In that period the Metropolitan and Chicago companies relied mainly on their repertories, with a few revivals, sometimes of almost forgotten works, and occasional productions, especially by the Chicago company, of French operas, including poor specimens of the later Massenet, such as "Cléopâtre," and Erlanger's ridiculous and vicious "Aphrodite," both of them serving as vehicles for the display of Miss Garden's indubitable charms. On the other hand, the Chicago company has to its credit "Le Chemineau," by Leroux, a lovely setting of Richepin's poetic play, and Debussy's "Pellèas et Mélisande." The Metropolitan went to Russia for "Boris," "Le Coq d'Or" and the delightful "Petrouchka" ballet by Stravinsky. It also staged Zandonai's unequal "Paolo e Francesca," while it produced two French novelties "Marouf," by Rabaud, and "La Reine Fiamette," by Leroux. The latter musically is extremely weak, while the former is a musicianly and fascinating work. But it was lost on the vast stage of the Metropolitan. It was produced on too grandiose a scale, and played and sung in too heavy a manner. It was, in fact, opéra comique played as grand opera. Another new French opera given at the Metropolitan last season was "The Blue Bird," a setting of Maeterlinck's poetic fantasy by Albert Wolff. The music has about the same values as the book. It is neither lyrical nor dramatic, but it forms an agreeable accompaniment to some charming ideas and an attractive stage spectacle, more suit-

able for children than adults. Gatti-Casazza also revived a few seasons back Bizet's "Les Pecheurs des Perles' and Gounod's idyllic "Mireille," but neither was strong enough to hold the boards. Among the most important and successful revivals of recent years have been "La Forza del Destino," by Verdi, a good example of his transitional period; "Le Prophéte," by Meyerbeer, a superb spectacle and dramatically effective; and "La Juive," by Halèvy, in which Caruso secured the greatest acting and artistic success of his career.

The reception of these works helps to demonstrate the contention that public taste leans towards operas which have a dramatic interest rather than to those which are conspicuous by their opportunities for vocal display. As to the revival of Leoncavallo's "Zaza," its undoubted success is due far less to any musical and dramatic merits which it possesses—for these are negligible—than to Miss Farrar's daring and realistic performance of the title rôle. By far the most splendid revivals in the records of the Metropolitan are Weber's "Oberon" and Boito's "Mefistofele," two works of consummate art. It should be added that Mr. Gatti-Casazza has given opportunities to American composers by producing de Koven's "Canterbury Pilgrims" and one or two other short operas, about which the less said the better, save and except Hadley's "Cleopatra's Night," in which unfortunately the librettist made a bad mess of Gautier's vivid little story.

There may be one or two omissions from our list, but they are not likely to be important. The object in giving it is to indicate the tendency of modern opera, and it may suggest little or nothing or much, according to the individual point of view. For my own part I think that satisfaction may be derived from it, for, as a rule, the finest works have been most successful. Although there are still, and most likely always will be, large audiences for the old war horses of lyric opera, in which the singer is paramount, Wagner retains his pre-eminence, while there is a growing demand for opera which makes an appeal to intelligence

and to the higher emotions. So long as men and women are born into the world with beautiful and wonderful voices there must be vehicles for their display; and Rossini, Donizetti, Verdi, Bellini, and a few others have provided for them generously enough. Possibly other composers will be found willing to do likewise, and the traditions of bel canto and coloratura will be additionally maintained. Opportunities for vocal display of a somewhat different character are also afforded by Puccini, Leoncavallo, Mascagni, and others of the modern Italian school. These later Italians, however, manifest a tendency to stress the dramatic values of the text rather than to give opportunities for vocal acrobatics and *tours de force*. Sometimes composers find it possible to combine lyrical beauty, calling forth a singer's best powers, with dramatic strength, as in the cases of Wagner, Boito and Montemezzi, not to omit the later Verdi, nor to forget Bizet, Gounod and Massenet. There must, in fact, be various forms of operatic composition, otherwise there would be monotony and fatigue. Operas never can and never will be cast all in the same mould. Above all one becomes quickly surfeited with the old type of Italian opera, which sacrificed almost everything to the singer, and treated the orchestra like a big guitar. Nevertheless, such works endure because through no other existing means could singers with wonderful voices and highly trained technique display their resources and accomplishments.

NO SIGN OF A NEW SCHOOL

There is no indication of the coming into existence of a new school of opera. Charpentier did not start a new school with his brilliantly realistic "Louise"; nor did Debussy with his exquisitely and vaguely impressionistic "Pellèas et Mélisande." Such works stand apart, and no one is likely to copy them or use them as models. The Russian school is fine but restricted. Nor can we look to Russia for a long time to come for important creative musical work, bearing in mind the present miseries of that country, and that men like Glazounow are starving. Italy still has its

Montemezzi, who, incidentally, was as much hampered by an indifferent poem in D'Annunzio's "La Nave" as he was aided by the superb sweep of Benelli's "L'Amore dei Tre Re." One could wish that Montemezzi would set the same author's "La Cene delle Beffe," played last season by the Barrymore brothers as "The Jest," for it is eminently suitable to operatic treatment. It is understood, however, that the work has been pre-empted by an Italian composer of lesser rank. Leoncavallo is dead, and, moreover, he never displayed ability to equal, much less improve upon, his "Pagliacci," although the Chicago company is producing this season his "Edipo Re." As for Puccini, judging from the Trittico and other works of recent years, musically he has shot his bolt. Marinuzzi, the brilliant young musical director of the Chicago company, has recently produced his "Jacquerie" in the Windy City, but it is not well spoken of. From France has come no new work of real significance since "Le Chemineau" and "Pellèas et Mélisande," while neither England nor America has yet produced an opera of commanding merit or importance.

The present tendency, however, is undoubtedly towards opera in which the book and music are of equal value and dramatic purport. It follows that in order to have new operas of the required standard good librettists must first of all be found. But where and how? The writing of an opera libretto is a thankless and almost profitless task, and few writers of prominence and ability will undertake it. The librettist is completely overshadowed by the composer, and is practically lost sight of. Wagner and Boito wrote their own libretti, for they were poets as well as musicians; but very few are similarly endowed. Possibly when the author of an opera book receives the same recognition and reward as the composer of the music there may be an improvement. It is a fact that many a great composer has been heavily handicapped by a bad book. Take, for instance, Mozart's "Magic Flute" and "Il Seraglio," and Weber's "Der Freischutz" and "Euryanthe." If the desire by our leading opera organizations to obtain new operas,

especially those of American origin, is sincere, care should be taken to secure good librettists and to reward them adequately.

Meanwhile Mr. Gatti-Casazza, of the Metropolitan Opera Company, and the management of the Chicago Opera Company are doing their best. They are perforce relying mainly on several operas of the old schools and a few of the more modern Italian and French works, as well as reverting to Wagner; while they are on the lookout for new works worthy of production. They are, as a rule, presenting opera with extraordinary completeness and attention to detail, as well as sometimes with fine artistic effect, as in the cases of "Mefistofele" and "La Nave," the superb scenery for which by Norman Bel Geddes has never been seen in New York. The public eagerly throngs to hear not only favorite singers, such as Caruso, Farrar, Galli-Curci and Raisa, but also takes equal delight in opera in which drama may be said to predominate. Therefore the modern tendency in opera can be regarded as encouraging, for at least there is no falling away in taste.

A word in conclusion as to the recent endeavor to popularize opera for the masses. Here is something which is eminently worthy of encouragement. In a country which gives no state or municipal aid to opera, it requires courage and a great deal more to present it adequately at popular prices. Hammerstein did so at the Manhattan Opera House and failed. Last season, however, Fortune Gallo tried it at the same place and succeeded remarkably. It may therefore be hoped that he will make the attempt again, and with equally satisfactory results. At present opera is mainly entertainment for the well-to-do classes, although hundreds cheerfully pay their dollar nightly in order to stand up at the Metropolitan and listen to their favorite singers. Opera is, in fact, a highly successful institution in New York, and in no other city in the world is it possible to give a consecutive six months' season of grand opera with anything approaching the same splendor and completeness.

BLUE LAWS, PAST AND FUTURE

By GUSTAVUS MYERS

FULL of confidence and enthusiasm certain organizations have set out on a national campaign to abolish various kinds of amusements and recreations on Sunday. The chief of these organizations is the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States. Allied with it in effort are other bodies having the same general program. Their aim is not that of moral suasion but of the incorporation in law of drastic statutes compelling the observance of a devotional, or at least what they term a non-secular, Sabbath. Connected with them in sympathy of purpose although not actual relationship are organizations seeking other forms of prohibition such as the use of tobacco. It is to this end that the Women's Christian Temperance Union and kindred associations are now industriously devoting their efforts.

The conspicuous feature of these movements is their fervent belief in the invincible power of legislation. The application of the summary force of law to personal tastes, habits and views and to social customs has long been recognized by the intelligent as a dangerous if not a futile field for the law to enter. The modern method in the United States—at least up to recently—was to award the real value to educational propaganda and to achieve results by appeal to voluntary action.

But the striking accomplishment of the liquor prohibitory movements in having their demands embodied in statutory and organic law has given a powerful and jubilant new impetus to a sweeping faith in the omnipotent compulsion of legislative acts. The practical sequel to these acts is still to be adjudged. Without, however, waiting for results, the

forces having what they are satisfied are reformative and regenerating missions convince themselves that the formal adoption of laws is the finality. This done they sanguinely think the remainder is easy. America being a law-abiding country, they assume that the people will obey whatever laws are passed, and any not inclined to act willingly will be sharply brought to terms by drastic penalties provided.

This appears attractive in theory. But it happens that the American people once underwent a long experiment with precisely the kind of laws that the present organizations are seeking to introduce. This experiment was made, too, at a time and under conditions that seemed auspiciously promising for its success.

During the long settlement period in Massachusetts, beginning about 1629, there was in general a homogeneity of religious composition. The Puritans were the sole rulers both of church and state which were then intertwined institutions. Unlike today there was no diversity of religious denominations. There was only one legally recognized sect, and that was the Puritan which was the established state religion. Quakers were penalized and banished, and other sects were discouraged. The Puritan ministry directed not only church affairs but legislation as well. At that tolerably primitive period there were also totally lacking the complex social and industrial conditions such as now confront us. The simplicity of existence, mainly of an agricultural character, demanded no such multiple of recreations and amusements as those which modern civilization has created. The whole tone and spirit of society were intensely religious and subdued. If ever sumptuary experiments were surrounded with a favorable atmosphere it was at that special period.

But what were the results of the attempts prosecuted with unparalleled zeal during many decades?

FUTILITY OF EARLY PURITAN BLUE LAWS

With a mighty faith in the punitive power of statutory law as a supplement to religious teaching, the General Court

of Election, which was the legislative body of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, set out to prevent or to attack by simultaneous enactments what it considered grevious sins and evils.

One of its very first measures was designed to obtain the strictly orthodox observance of what it styled the Lord's Day and to secure religion and the church against blasphemy. The first General Letter of the Governor and Deputy of the New England Company to the Governor and Council of Massachusetts, sent from England, April 17, 1629, gave these instructions which became fixed law: "And to the end the Sabbath may be celebrated in a religious manner, we appoint, that all that inhabit the plantation, both for the general and particular employments, may surcease their labor every Saturday throughout the year at 3 of the clock in the afternoon, and that they spend the rest of that day in catechizing and preparation for the Sabbath as the ministers shall direct."

But this law proved unavailing, and five years later the General Court proceeded to decree penalties. The preamble of the law of March 4, 1634, said that complaints had been made that divers persons usually absented themselves from church meetings on the Lord's Day. Absence from church was made a specific misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than five shillings for every offence or by imprisonment. It was fully believed that this law would be a potent deterrent. The enforcement agencies were all in the hands of the church; the constables were church members, and the magistrates church elders. Under a long-existing Puritan law, passed on May 18, 1631, no one was allowed political suffrage or office who was not a member of the Puritan church.

But the law of 1634 also seems to have lacked the effect expected, for on November 4, 1646, the General Court found it necessary to pass a severer law. It declared that anyone showing contempt of public worship by being absent (without just cause) from church upon the Lord's Day or upon public fast or feast days of Thanksgiving was to be

fined five shillings. Anyone renouncing church connections and thus reflecting upon church ordinances was, upon conviction, to forfeit to the public treasury forty shillings for every month that he or she continued in obstinacy. For open contempt toward the Bible and the clergy by any accusation of error of teaching or doctrine, the offender was "for the first scandal" to be publicly lectured by a magistrate and bound to good behavior. For the second offense he or she either had to pay £5 to the public treasury, "or stand two hours openly upon a block four foot high, on a lecture day, with a paper fixed on his breast, with this A WANTON GOSPELLER written in capital letters, that others may fear and be ashamed of breaking into the like wickedness."

CHILDREN INCLUDED IN NEW LAWS

This law was formidable enough. Yet it, too, was evidently ineffectual, and the clerical law-makers now went to further extremes to compel observance of the Sabbath. On August 30, 1653, the General Court passed a new law of much wider and stricter application than the scope of previous laws. This new law comprehended not only adults but children. Its preamble gives a sufficient idea of the disinclination of many persons to be repressed by rigid formulas. "Upon information," it read, "of sundry abuses and misdemeanors, committed by sundry persons on the Lord's Day, not only by children playing in the streets and other places, but by youths, maids and other persons, both strangers and others, uncivilly walking the streets and fields, traveling from town to town, going on shipboard, frequenting common houses and other places to drink, sport and otherwise misspend that precious time, which things tend much to the dishonor of God, the reproach of religion, grieving the souls of God's servants," etc.

Therefore, it was enacted that no children, youths, maids or others should so trangress during daylight of the Lord's Day "on penalty of being reputed great provokers of the

high displeasure of Almighty God." All parents and governors of children about seven years old ("not," specified the law, "that we approve younger children in evil") should, for the first offense, be admonished; for the second offense, a fine of five shillings was to be imposed; ten shillings for the third offense, and for the fourth indictment was to follow. For all youths and maids more than fourteen years old, and all older persons convicted of the crime of "playing, uncivil walking, drinking, traveling from town to town, going on shipboard, sporting or in any way misspending that precious time" a series of penalties was provided. If those convicted were unable or unwilling to pay fines, they were to be whipped by the constable. This punishment was not to exceed five stripes for ten shillings fine. The enactment decreed that copies of the law were to be conspicuously posted on church doors for a month at least. But this law instead of producing the results intended only provoked resentment.

IRRITATION AND RESENTMENT FOMENTED

This was evidenced by another Lord's Day law passed the very next year—on October 18, 1654. It recited that "experience gives us cause to complain of much disorder in time of public ordinances, in the meeting houses [which was what the churches were then called], in the several congregations, in this jurisdiction, through the irreverent carriage and behavior of divers young persons." This law superadded new methods to existing laws. It required town selectmen to nominate two or more persons as a standing committee whose duty it was to reform the aforesaid young persons either by serious reproof or other warning, public or private, and hand them over to the magistrate or town commissioners for meet correction. "And we are not doubtful," the law read on, "but the reverend elders of the congregations, according to their wisdom will so order the time of their public exercise [church services], that none shall be ordinarily occasioned to break off from the congregation before the full conclusion of public exercise."

But this law, judging from the evidences, proved as fu-

tile as all of its predecessors. So we find that four years later, on October 19, 1658, the General Court deemed it essential to pass another law. The preamble of this lamented how sad experience had shown that after sunset every Saturday and on the Lord's Day "young people and others take liberty to walk and sport themselves in the streets and fields in the several towns of this jurisdiction . . . and to frequently repair to public houses of entertainment and there sit drinking." All of this tended, said the preamble "not only to the hindering of due preparation for the Sabbath, but inasmuch as in them lies renders the ordinances of God altogether unprofitable, and threatens rooting out of the power of godliness, and procuring the wrath and judgment of God upon us and our posterity." It was decreed by this law that anyone who shall be found, either on Saturday after sunset or on the Lord's Day, sporting in the streets or fields or (except strangers or sojourners) drinking or being in any house of entertainment, should be arrested. Upon conviction the offender was to pay five shillings fine for every such transgression or suffer corporal punishment, as the magistrates decided.

If this law had any success it was but slight and temporary. A law of October 20, 1663, remitted all fines for Lord's Day violations to the use of the towns. A new law of August 1, 1665, complained that the law of 1663 made "the laws for the reclaiming of such enormities ineffectul." The meaning of this evidently was that the law of 1663 allowed local town sentiment to influence mitigatingly the law's operation.

In its law of 1665 the General Court declared that it "being sensible that through the wicked practices of many persons who do profane God's holy Sabbaths, and contemn the public worship of his house, the name of God is greatly dishonored and the profession of his people here greatly scandalized as tending to all profaneness and irreligion." The law of 1665 ordered that fines for profanation of the Sabbath and for contempt or neglect of public worship go to the general treasury, as formerly. Anyone refusing to pay the fine was to be corporeally punished.

To evade this law, it became customary to gather in houses and have social parties. The General Court sought to prevent these by a law that it passed on October 15, 1673. By this enactment every public-house keeper in whose place any persons were found transgressing was to be fined five shillings.

SERVILE WORK ON SUNDAY BANNED

Meanwhile, on October 14, 1668, came another Lord's Day law. This had a double aim. One declared purpose was that "for the better prevention of the breach of the Sabbath" it was enacted that no servile work was to be done on that day. Only works of piety, charity and necessity were allowed. For infraction the penalty was ten shillings fine for the first offence. For every offence thereafter the fine was to be progressively doubled. The other purpose of the law was the less open one of preventing Quaker services. The second section of the law placed in the same category as those doing servile work any person traveling by foot, horseback or by boats on the Lord's Day to any unlawful assembly or meeting not allowed by law. Those doing this were declared profaners of the Sabbath and amenable to prosecution. By previous laws Quaker assemblies had been made illegal.

A multiplicity of Lord's Day laws now burden the statute books. But more came. On November 3, 1675, the General Court passed a law, the preamble of which set forth that "there is so much profaneness amongst us in persons turning their backs upon the public worship before it be finished and the blessing pronounced." This situation the law of 1675 sought to remedy by empowering church officers or selectmen to appoint guards to prevent anybody going out by shutting the church doors "or any other meet way to attain their end."

The continuation of Sabbath violations caused the passage of another law on March 24, 1677. This law required that twice a year, in March and September, all of the laws for the sanctification of the Sabbath and preventing its pro-

fanation, be publicly read by all of the ministers on the Lord's Day, and all the people sternly cautioned to observe them. But much as the ministers desired the array of laws they did not relish the task of reading them. So, on October 15, 1679, they had this section of the law amended making the constable or town clerk do the public readings.

A SPYING INQUISITION CREATED

The second section of the law of May 24, 1677, created a spying inquisition. It ordered the town selectmen to appoint one inspector to every ten families on whose actions he was to keep close watch. He was given the power, in the absence of the constable, to arrest all Sabbath breakers, hale them before a magistrate and put them in prison. The law of May 24, 1677, also ordered that cages be erected in the market place in Boston and other towns, and offenders kept in them until the magistrates decided their future punishment. To provide against inspectors being partial or lenient to neighbors, the General Court passed, on October 10, 1677, a supplementary act. It gave the inspectors power to enter private as well as public houses, and to go into one another's precincts at will.

Still another law was enacted on October 15, 1679. No footman, horseman, horse or cart was allowed to pass in or out of Boston or any other town on Saturday night after sunset. It was ordered that watches be stationed at certain points, and anyone not proving the necessity of his business was to be arrested as a Sabbath breaker. This law particularly opened the fertile way to petty graft.

These are some examples of the succession of efforts to force by legislation the observance of the Sabbath. They extended over a period of fifty years, and each in turn was so ineffective that in the constant attempt to fortify laws already passed, new laws radiating in every direction had to be continuously added. This was equally true of the code of sumptuary laws seeking to regulate tobacco, gambling, personal dress and many other habits and practices.

DRASTIC CENSORSHIP ACT

The admission of failure was not made by any newspaper press. No such thing as liberty of the press existed. To prevent criticism of its acts or exposure of conditions, the General Court, when the printing press threatened to become aggressive, passed a stringent censorship act. By the law of October 8, 1662, the consent of two censors—and these were clergymen—had to be first obtained before any copy of any publication, whether pamphlet, newspaper, broadside or book, was printed. This law was repealed on May 27, 1663, but the next year, on October 19, 1664, the censorship law of 1662 was restored and the power was vested in a specified committee of clergymen. Censorship of the press remained until well within the eighteenth century.

The failure of its repressive acts was practically self-admitted by the General Court of Massachusetts in its numerous preambles during the period here cited, as well as by those legislatures of later periods. The story of Plymouth Colony is precisely the same, as also that of Connecticut and other colonies imitating the Massachusetts laws. Human nature could not stand nor liberal denominations tolerate the complicated structure of constrictive legislation, and it fell by its own incongruity and deadly weight. The popular feeling against church-made legislation was shown by the separation of state and church after the American Revolution. Many of the laws long remained on the statute books, and remnants still survive. But they increasingly became what were expressively styled "dead letters," mute relics of an age the extreme repressions of which had proved their own inevitable undoing.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

By HON. DANIEL F. COHALAN

TO MOST of us, the United States of America is the name that connotes our country as distinguished from all other lands and the term, American, is that one by which we set ourselves apart from all other peoples.

The one means to us a land, in many undefined ways superior to all others, and the other marks the badge of citizenship which stamps us, despite all our shortcomings, real and imaginary, as "the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time."

How we came to be here; how we emerged in less than a short century and a half from obscurity to greatness, from a minor position among dependencies to a major one among the nations, is a matter that gives little trouble to the average man and not much concern to the majority of the well informed.

So greatly are we obsessed with the idea of our power and consequence that we do not often recall the fact that we began to exist so recently;—nay, most of us feel instinctively that we sprang into existence full grown and full armed like Minerva from the head of Jupiter. A little research will show, however,—and it is a matter of supreme congratulation to us that it should be so,—that we are not the result of chance; not the consequence of accident; and that our present position has come to us as the natural evolution of the lines carefully planned and thought out upon which as a country our ship of state was constructed.

To all in a general way the story of the Revolution is known—the tale of the military and naval victories which helped us so greatly to cut the leading strings binding us to Europe. Few realize that it was to the extraordinary

statesmanship and the diplomatic vision and skill of some of our early leaders that the great experiment in Democratic government which was set up on the North American continent was enabled to get fairly started and then to go forward by leaps and bounds until we reached in wealth and resources the first place among the nations.

We gained our liberty, in the main, through the splendid fighting of the Revolutionary army and through seven long years of bitter suffering and struggle, but the fruits of it were gathered by the diplomacy of Washington and by those who acted with him in the early days of our independence. Diplomats as a whole have been of late years much abused and maligned, but the student of history recognizes that there is a great field of government which can be filled only by the diplomat and that his achievements frequently contribute more to the growth and progress of a nation than do those of the great soldier and sailor. Washington and his associates realized that the only chance of creating on these shores a government that would be permanent was by removing the country from the quarrels of Europe and centering the activities of our people upon a solution of the problems which confronted them in the new country and which would enable them, while remaining aloof from the quarrels of the Old World, to establish and develop commercial intercourse with all of mankind. They saw clearly that to succeed, we must be politically isolated from the rest of the world; that we must attend to our own political affairs, to the exclusion of all others; but at the same time they realized that our commercial relations with the rest of mankind must be as close and intimate as possible. Upon this foundation of political isolation and commercial connection the wonderful superstructure of our greatness has been erected.

WASHINGTON'S WISDOM

Washington sensed, at its full value, the truth that a country, to become great, has to possess both political and economic freedom, and his insight, little short of inspired—

for one who has been often spoken of as at best a "polished provincial,"—shows him to have had an understanding of world politics in their broadest sense, which ranks him as one of the great men of all history.

Upon his simple and easily understood policies, the whole foreign relations of our country have been built up and their application today, with the natural additions required by the changes made by our growth, by our modern inventions and by the new problems with which we have been brought into contact, will bring us safely through all difficulties and dangers. Washington saw for us safety and security in keeping out of the quarrels of Europe. He was a nationalist and not an internationalist—and intent upon acquiring and preserving full and complete indepnd-ence for our country.

John Adams, one of the most capable statesmen of that period, warned the confederation at the very beginning of our national existence, against an entangling alliance with France, the nation to which we owed so much. Washington, in his Farewell Address, urged upon the federal government, with all the strength at his command, the avoidance of entangling alliances and the insistence upon a policy of political isolation. As he well said in words whose significance is never greater than at present: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation." He recognized that for three hundred years, before the foundation of our country, four great countries had struggled for supremacy in this hemisphere, and that during a large part of that time the American colonies had been the plaything of monarchical and imperial ambitions. In 1494 the Western Hemisphere was divided between Spain and Portugal, but the Portugese shortly thereafter centered their interests in India and left the Spanish Empire to be supreme in America. In 1497 Henry the VII of England sent the navigator, John Cabot, to discover the much talked of Northwest passage to India. Cabot returned in the same year after having discovered the mainland of North America for which in the quaint language

of the old chronicler he was rewarded most handsomely, as appears by the entry in the privy purse account, by, as it is entered, the payment "to him that found the New Isle ten pounds."

ENGLAND IN AMERICA

England, then setting out on the career of world conquest which had produced the present British Empire, became more and more interested with each generation in America, and under Elizabeth, with the defeat of the Armada in 1588, she destroyed the Spanish control of the seas, and was able in 1607 to make the first permanent English settlement upon the continent at Jamestown. Since that time the interest England had in all our hemisphere including the Spanish colonies and in the Latin-American Republics which have developed from them has been consistent and progressive. In every complication touching those countries, whether with Spain or the United States, England has always kept an alert eye, looking out for her interest; and in all negotiations has hovered in the background as an interested and wary participant. In the early days she sought by conflict and negotiation to extend her territories and for generations carried on a constantly succeeding campaign of aggression against Spain and France, as well as against Holland which had acquired what promised to be a strong foothold upon the continent from which she was quickly eliminated through the economic pressure of the navigation laws which England put into operation, co-incident with acquiring the control of the seas. It is interesting to observe that the map of North America in 1564 shows a solid block of Spanish territory, from approximately the tenth to the fortieth degree of latitude, including Central America, Mexico and the present limits of the United States as far north as New Jersey. Not until 1670 did Spain formally, and by treaty, acknowledged the existence of colonies of the English, French and Dutch, and in the entire period from 1613 to 1815, the various colonies were constantly involved to a greater or lesser degree in the successive

series of European wars. After 1688 the contest for supremacy on the continent narrowed down to a bitter conflict between the French and English participants, and in 1754, in the struggle which then centered in the contest for control of the Ohio Valley, George Washington, fated, a generation afterwards, to drive the English from the Thirteen colonies, made his first military expedition. It was in this struggle as Voltaire said: "that a torch lighted in the forests of America set all Europe in conflagration." It was undoubtedly from the accumulation of experiences, many of which he began to gather from this date on, that Washington said: "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop."

THE SEVEN YEARS WAR

The Seven Years War had definite consequences for the colonies. First, there were the territorial considerations, especially with relation to the West Indies and Canada; then, nearer home, the question of the racial ownership of the Mississippi. The political alignment of France and Spain in 1761 in the Family Compact had equally important results. During this war England made direct efforts to conquer Canada then held by the French, and also made a naval attack upon the West Indies. A hundred years before a similar attack under the direction of Cromwell, had in 1655 resulted in the conquest of Jamaica. Elizabeth and Cromwell—two different types of English empire builders—had both thrust at Spain. Under Pitt—the third type—the thrust was made at France. Minorca, in the Mediterranean, had been lost to France. Public opinion demanded an equivalent gain. The American expeditions were set forth and Cuba and Guadaloupe were conquered.

There are in existence to-day an interesting series of maps of Jefferys, an English mapmaker, which covered the territorial points of this campaign. On it appear the North-

west coast, the Mosquito shore, New Orleans and several of the West Indies. Some are marked "done from drawings captured from the Spanish in the late war." Another is inscribed "done from actual surveys and observations of the English, whilst the Island (Guadaloupe) was in their possession," and another marked "with material improvements added since the conquest of 1764."

CONTEST FOR WEST INDIES

The question of the possession of the West Indies obsessed the English mind.

In 1690—long before the making of books was universal—an account was published by one Thomas Dalby, entitled, "Historical account of the West India colonies (*sic*) and of the great advantages they are to England in respect to trade."

These seemingly irrelevant details show that Canning, instead of initiating English interest in Spanish-American colonies, as is popularly assumed, acted in accordance with a definite English policy which had existed for centuries, and which had for its purpose the destruction of the Spanish commercial monopoly.

The treaty of Paris in 1763 which concluded this war was of vital concern to the colonists and had an immediate bearing on the series of treaties which closed the Revolutionary War, and gave to the colonists a national status. This treaty involved the general questions of the governmental and commercial relations of Europe and of America; the direction of Spanish-American commerce; the specific questions of the ownership of the great inland waterways; of the valley of the Mississippi; and the great lake regions; and, not of less importance, the possession of the West Indies and their trade. The boundaries then laid down established what have become the points of contact for the United States. France ceded the Ohio valley to England and divided that portion of that country known as Louisiana between England and Spain; England receiving the Eastern part and Spain the country West of the Mississippi. The

port of New Orleans—and with it the commercial control of the Mississippi—was ceded to Spain in return for the assistance which she had given to France. England obtained Canada and very reluctantly gave up Cuba as the price of Florida, and Guadaloupe as the price of Canada. It is interesting in this connection to know that Benjamin Franklin, then the Colonial agent in London, was chiefly instrumental in bringing about this decision. It was only, however, the belief that Colonial jealousy would prevent union, that persuaded England to remove the menace of the hostile French colony of the North. Her merchants complained long and earnestly over the loss of the rich sugar Island of Guadaloupe and deeply regretted the necessity for returning Cuba, Martinique and St. Lucia.

The British dominion—including Canada—now comprised the entire Eastern part of the continent, bounded on the West by the Mississippi and excepting only New Orleans. With her proverbial adroitness, England did not fail to include in the treaty a clause guaranteeing to her the free navigation of the Mississippi, and in addition she held the Bahama Islands, Jamaica and a portion of the coast of Central America—Belize the nucleus of British Honduras.

It has been asserted that, during the colonial period, England acted as the guardian of American commerce and that the colonies had freedom of trading privileges within the Empire.

COLONIAL GRIEVANCES

An examination of the documents in which the colonists stated the justice of their case to the world disproves this assertion. In the declaration of Colonial Rights in 1774 we find the following comment on commercial restrictions:

> "But from the necessity of the case and a regard to the mutual interest of both countries we cheerfully consent to the operation of such acts of the British Parliament, as are bona fide, restrained to the regulation of our external commerce for the purpose of securing the commercial advantages of the whole Empire to the mother country, and the benefits of its respective members; excluding every idea of taxation, internal or external, for raising a revenue on the subjects of America, without their consent."

The recital of their grievances to the inhabitants of the several Anglo-American colonies in the same year, states that the stamp act was repealed "not because it was founded on an erroneous principle," but, as the repealing act recites, "because the continuance thereof would be attended with many inconveniences and might be productive of consequences greatly detrimental to the commercial interest of Great Britain." This statement says further that the "administration determined to subdue a spirit of freedom, which English Ministers should have rejoiced to cherish; entered into a monopolizing combination with the East-India Company, to send to this continent vast quantities of tea, an article on which a duty was laid by a statute, that, in a peculiar manner attacked the liberties of America, and which, therefore, the inhabitants of these colonies had resolved not to import."

The first Continental Congress had passed a resolution "to enter into a non-importation, non-consumption and non-exportation agreement or association." With reference to this the colonists said to their fellow Anglo-American colonists "we have chosen a method of opposition that does not preclude a hearty reconciliation with our fellow citizens on the other side of the Atlantic. We deeply deplore the urgent necessity that presses us to an immediate interruption of commerce *that may prove injurious to them.* . . . Against the temporary inconveniences you may suffer from a stoppage of trade, you will weigh in the opposite balance the endless miseries you and your descendants must endure from an established arbitrary power." In the reply of the Continental Congress to Lord North's Conciliatory Resolution, July 17th, 1775, they rejected the proposition as altogether unsatisfactory, reciting, among other reasons, that the English government "To show they mean no discountenance of injury, they pass acts at the very time of holding out this proposition, for restraining the commerce and fisheries of the province of New England and for interdicting the trade of other colonies with all foreign nations, and with each other." In the declaration of the causes and necessity of

taking up arms, adopted by the Second Continental Congress, we find the words: "for interdicting all commerce to the capital of another," and the statement that "the commercial intercourse of whole colonies with foreign countries, and with each other, was cut off by an act of Parliament; by another several of them were entirely prohibited from the fisheries in the seas near their coasts, in which they always depend for their subsistence."

FOR CUTTING OFF TRADE

The Declaration of Independence in 1776, among the list of grievances, stated tersely, "for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world."

The clearest exposition of trade restrictions is in the report of the Continental Congress rejecting Lord North's Conciliatory Resolution. "We are of the opinion," they say, "it is not just that the colonists should be required to oblige themselves to other contributions, while Great Britain possesses a monopoly of their trade. This of itself lays them under a heavy contribution. To demand, therefore, additional aids in the form of a tax is to demand the double of their equal proportion. If we are to contribute with the other parts of the Empire, let us equally with them enjoy free commerce with the whole world. But while the restrictions of our trade shut to us the resources of wealth, is it just we should bear all other burthens equally with those to whom every resource is open?"

These statements clearly show that commercial restrictions were regarded as a serious grievance by the colonists. It is equally clear from a study of the Revolutionary period that France, in addition to weakening her English rival, hoped to profit by that trade which the colonies had withdrawn from England. In pursuance of this principle, on February 6th, 1778, two treaties were concluded between France and the United States, one of alliance, the other of amity and commerce. In spite of the many advantages of this proceeding, John Adams had learned so well the complications arising from European connections that he ad-

vised strongly against entering into an "entangling alliance" with France. An "entangling alliance" it proved later to be.

It is an interesting feature of this treaty of alliance that the only territories specified are the Islands of Bermudas, which France seemed to think it would be desirable to have federated with or dependent on the United States, reserving for herself the right to attack and possess "any of the Islands situated in the Gulph of Mexico, or near that Gulph, which are at present under the power of Great Britain."

(*To be continued*)

COOL WET WIND

By GUSTAVE DAVIDSON

COOL wet wind,
Entwined with glimmering lights and drifting rain
And things forlorn,
Play soothingly upon this tear-stained face
Thy most delicious balm,
That with such fresh and aromatic breath
As thrills me now,
I may not think to weep.

Thou art kind
To find me at my window, weak with pain,
With anguish worn,
And gently o'er my feverish spirit trace
Thy lenitive and calm.
Ah, with such a restful wind in death
As fills me now
How beautiful to sleep!

AN EXPERIMENT IN CO-OPERATIVE MARKETING

By FRANK KNOX

THIS makes no pretense of being the outgivings of an expert. The writer is merely an average business man of New England who has watched with grave concern the retrogression of agriculture in New Hampshire and in New England and who has enough cause to deduce the inevitable effect upon New England as the "workshop of America" if food costs continue to mount because of the gradual decay of New England agriculture and the long distance food supplies must be transported to become available for New England consumption.

There is no escape from the fact of a waning agriculture in New Hampshire and throughout New England. The census of 1910 and 1920 tell a tale of fewer farms, diminished acreage, disappearing stock and herds and steadily lowered returns to those who persist in their efforts to wrest a living from New England soil. The movement of men and women away from the farm and to the centers of population is seen in its most acute phase here. And little has been attempted, or done, to halt this movement thus far. Probably the waning of agriculture in New England which set in shortly after the close of the Civil War was found to continue until the vast uncultivated but rich areas of the West were settled up and made productive. But that cause no longer exists. The lands in the West are all taken up. There are no longer great areas open to the homesteader and Western cultivated land has enhanced in value until the opportunity for money-making at farming, East and West, has become approximately equalized. Over against

the greater fertility of the Western farm must be set the distance from market, in many cases entire absence of a local market, while in favor of the New England farm must be counted the tremendous asset of a market almost at the farmer's door.

Despite this process of equalization, this balancing of advantages, a return movement to the farm in New England is not perceptible. The tendency of people of means in the cities to purchase idle hill farms in New Hampshire, Vermont and western Massachusetts accounts for a small decrease in the number of abandoned farms, but this feature of the situation has but slight economic significance. The simple, unadorned truth is that professional agriculture in New England and in New Hampshire is still on the down grade.

AN OMINOUS FACT

Here is a fact of unescapable ominousness, a portent that stretches a shadow not only over the farms of New England, but over its mills, factories and shoe shops as well. Decreasing food production and constantly heightened food costs, contrasted with the cost of the same food supplies in the Middle West, constitute a deadly menace to New England industrial prosperity in the future. The problem of a waning agriculture in New England is not the problem solely of the agricultural class of this section, it is emphatically the problem of all New England. Relatively higher living costs mean, inevitably, relatively higher labor costs in industry, and in the keen competition which New England manufacturers must meet in the days ahead, this additional handicap may easily spell industrial decadence for the oldest and most developed industrial region of the entire country.

What is to be done? Can anything be done? Is there any remedy?

I believe there is. My study of the question I have sought to make along the accustomed lines of a business man seeking the cause of a break-down in a given industry.

Farm failures in New Hampshire are not due, as it is widely believed, to the non-productivity of the soil. There is in the State a surprisingly large acreage of arable land. It will probably surprise many to be told that New Hampshire stands third in the United States in the yield of corn per acre. Not that this means New Hampshire is suited to corn culture. It is not. Bulk crops of that character do not lend themselves to advantageous cultivation in this region. I merely cite this fact to demonstrate that the soil itself is productive. That is not the difficulty with New Hampshire farming.

Nor is the trouble to be found in the character of the farm population, or the quality of the farm labor available. Both are equal to, or above, the average the country over. The trouble cannot be found in failure to adopt modern farm methods. The first horseless farm in the United States was a New Hampshire farm. New Hampshire farmers are as avid for real improvement in their farming methods as the farmers of any State in the Union.

It is not absence of a market. No farming class anywhere in America enjoys greater advantages in this respect than New England farmers. The people of New Hampshire in 1919 spent more than eighty million dollars for food-stuffs alone, not twenty-five per cent of which were grown in the State. Of course, not all food-stuffs used could be produced within the State but a partial survey made by the State Bureau of Markets of the New Hampshire Department of Agriculture in 1919 revealed that nearly eighteen million dollars were expended, outside of the State, for seasonable farm products, every dollar's worth of which could have been produced on New Hampshire farms. No, the market for every ounce of food-stuffs grown from New Hampshire soil may be found readily within the State itself.

ROOT OF AGRICULTURAL DECADENCE

But study of the question of market availability brings one sharply up against what I am convinced is the real root

of agricultural decadence in this section. This fundamental fault is the present system of sale and distribution of the products of the farm. No business of any character could ever attain permanent stability and financial success which habitually sold its product in a buyer's market. Every successful business must exercise at least a fifty-fifty control over the sale of its product. This the New Hampshire farmer has never achieved. His crude methods of sale have left him completely at the mercy of either his local market, which he can reach by wagon road, or of some middleman who surrounds his dealings with the farmer with every conceivable price-depressing influence he can command. Either the local dealer, or the traveling commission broker fixes the price, taking advantage of lack of competition, ignorance on the part of the farmer of the market value of his commodity, and the pressing financial necessity for the average farmer to convert his crop into money at harvest time in order to meet his obligations. No industry could possibly survive such a handicap. It is fatal.

To illustrate in a simple, understandable fashion how trifling is the farmer's control over the price of that which he produces and how outrageously the middlemen sometimes gouge the consuming public, through their control of the fruits of the toil of other hands, I submit an official table prepared by the State Bureau of Markets, showing the price received in September, 1919, by New Hampshire farmers for certain seasonable products and the price at which these same commodities were sold by the middlemen three to six months later when withdrawn from cold storage:

Farmers' Prices.	Middleman's Prices.	Inc.
Potatoes, per cwt.....$2.50 to 2.65	$5.25 to 5.50	100pc.
Beets, per bu..... 1.00 to 1.25	2.00 to 2.50	100pc.
Carrots, per bu..... .75 to 1.00	1.25 to 1.50	125pc.
Cabbages, per cwt..... 1.00 to 1.50	4.00 to 6.00	400pc.
Onions, per cwt..... 1.50 to 1.85	3.00 to 3.50	200pc.
Squash, per cwt..... 1.25 to 1.50	3.00 to 5.00	300pc.
Turnips, per bu..... .75 to 1.00	1.25 to 1.75	80pc.

There are present in these figures two obvious lessons. Whatever of profit there was in the crop of 1919 in New Hampshire was garnered, not by the farmers, but by the

middlemen. And the increase in cost to the consumer constituted unconscionable profiteering.

Why was the middleman enabled to squeeze the farmer down in the price he received to less than cost, and how could he force up the price to the consumer to such indefensible heights?

Because he possessed TWO things—organization for buying and selling, and the necessary capital to provide storage and to hold the produce until the market demand was acute.

THE FARMER'S VITAL NEED

The farmer is never going to accomplish the result he must accomplish in order to make agriculture profitable until he, too, has at his command a selling organization in expert hands, storage facilities in which to hold his produce, and the requisite banking credit so as to procure reasonable advances on his harvested crop, in storage, to carry him until the produce actually reached the market. These things he cannot accomplish alone. They may only be achieved through a pooling of interests—through co-operation.

And vital as it is to the farmer that such co-operation be brought about, it is no less vital to the consumer, too. Unless we halt and reverse the present tendency away from agriculture to urban employment, the costs of living will continue to mount. And mounting costs in the necessities of life, in New England, mean inevitably and certainly a decadent New England, industrially. Not only is New England agriculture at stake while we search for a remedy in the farmer's method of marketing his produce, but New England industry itself awaits the same issue.

Can we do this? Let the story of the wool-growers of Rockingham county, New Hampshire, be the answer. Almost everyone knows what happened to the price of wool this year. It dropped down from a figure of nearly a dollar a pound to fifteen to twenty-five cents a pound. It is unnecessary to add that the latter price, to the wool-grower, spelled ruinous loss. The wool-growers, confronted with

this situation, through the Rockingham County Farmers' Exchange, a co-operative organization, decided to pool their interests. They sent their entire wool clip to Boston to be scoured and graded. They then sent it to a woolen mill in Milford, in this State, to be made into the highest grade, all-wool blankets, which the mill agreed to deliver to them at eleven dollars a pair. Every blanket thus produced was sold without difficulty since eleven dollars represented about half the retail price and the farmers of Rockingham County received from fifty to fifty-five cents a pound for all their wool!

But such rudimentary co-operative marketing methods as those employed by the wool-growers of Rockingham do not cover the case, for wool is one of the non-perishable products of the farm. The farmer must supply himself not alone with a sales organization in expert hands but he must also provide himself with the storage facilities and grading machinery employed by the middlemen as a means of avoiding a glutted market and of preparing the produce for market in such form and with such guarantees as to quality as will command confidence on the part of the buying public.

Is this practicable?

In Essex County, Massachusetts, the farmers are sufficiently sure that it is practicable to have invested their money in a co-operative storage plant. The Essex County farmers have finally become converted to the truth of the well-established business policy that where the individual can not, of himself, control the conditions under which he sells his product, he can achieve this advantage through association and co-operation with others engaged in the same business or trade. This is, of course, the underlying principle of the labor union and no man challenges the benefits which co-operation and organization have brought to the worker. It is exactly as true of capital, engaged in business, as it is of labor. Combinations of capital, in which the joint wealth of many is made to work as a unit for the benefit of those who thus join together has made possible

almost all of modern industrial progress. There was a time when both business and labor were individualistic, but that time was in the remote past. The farmer, however, is still individualistic, and what is being attempted in Essex County is to promote the same kind of co-operation among farmers as has been so notably successful when applied to the capital, or labor, in industry.

Instead of the individual farmers of Essex County, each trying to find a market for his produce alone, and thus playing into the hands of the middleman, whose whole purpose is to buy the farmer's produce at the lowest possible price, the Essex County farmers have joined hands and are about to build at Danvers a co-operative storage plant, for all of its members.

Under such an arrangement, the produce of Essex County farms will be assembled at one place and thus sufficient volume is assured to make its sale easier and more profitable. For those commodities which reach the market at a time of glut, when prices are down, the food storage facilities of the plant are available to hold such food-stuffs until a good market is assured. The agent and representative of these farmers is also, under such circumstances, enabled to look about for the best available market and to sell in that market under favorable conditions. In other words, what the farmers of Essex County propose to do is to supplant the middleman, and thus bring the producer and consumer nearer together. It is also inevitable that under such an arrangement the representative of the farmers at Danvers will sell the bulk of his produce in the nearest market, and thus save to both producer and consumer the uneconomic waste of a long haul.

WHAT NEW HAMPSHIRE IS DOING

New Hampshire is a small State. It is compact and well served by railroads, interurbans and a splendid system of highways. It is an ideal community to serve as a laboratory for the purposes of testing, upon a State-wide scale, the application of this principle of co-operative marketing for

general farm products. Already some of the keenest farmers, bankers and business men of the State are deeply interested in the project. A State-wide organization is in the process of formation. Soon will be put into motion the wheels of this experimental machine which is to determine if agriculture can actually be made as profitable as the average business, with the same capital investment, in the cities.

Eventually the plan contemplates a State-wide selling organization, intimately connected in its operations with the State Bureau of Markets of the New Hampshire Agricultural Department, closely tied up with the farm extension and county agent departments of the New Hampshire College of Agriculture, and built up about the various county farmers' exchanges which are already in successful operation in sixty per cent of the counties of the State. Distributed at advantageous points throughout the State we hope to see erected farmers' cold-storage plants and warehouses, which will serve as collection, grading and distributing centers for the areas served. This selling organization is going after the HOME MARKET, and since the plan contemplates entire elimination of all middlemen between the farmer and the retailer, and the avoidance of all unnecessary transportation, it ought to be possible not only to give the farmer some of the profits now absorbed by the middlemen and unnecessary transportation charges, but also to control to a very considerable extent the cost to the consumer, since there would seem to be ample grounds for believing that the farmers' sales department will dominate the home market. We cannot hope to produce all that we consume but we can produce enough to hold strategic control of our own market and compel produce imported from without the State to meet genuine competitive conditions, thus keeping food costs down.

What New Hampshire is embarking upon is not wholly an experiment. California fruit growers have demonstrated its practicability. It is unique only in the breadth of field it covers. It will be the first State-wide effort in co-opera-

tive marketing, and it will be the first trial of this principle applied to general farm products. We know it will sell oranges, and we know it will sell milk. We believe it will sell the various products of the general farmer of New Hampshire. At least we are going to put it to the test.

TWILIGHT

By GRAHAM FLIPPEN

IN that mystic borderland that lies
Between the world and twilight skies,
The sun steals down its molten way
And slips quite gently from the day.

The stillness of the dying light
Breathes silently of coming night:
That whisper that subdues yet thrills
The distant watcher on the hills.

Then twilight as on angel's wings
Sends forth its spell o'er living things;
And bending down from realms afar
Gives to the earth the evening star.

DIRECT PRIMARIES

By J. B. W. GARDINER

IT HAS been widely and authoritatively advertised that one of the first acts of the new Republican administration in New York State, will be to repeal the direct primary law which was placed on the statute books through the efforts of Charles E. Hughes when he was Governor of the State. The reasons that have been given for this proposed action are mainly two: The first is, that to have a primary before election means, in effect, to have two elections and hence doubles the cost of the election to the State. The second is, that the law is a failure because the people take no interest in it and do not vote.

As to the first it may be said that it does greatly increase the cost of government. But all elections increase the cost of government. They are expensive affairs at best. Why, then, not eliminate both the primary and the election and save twice, rather than only once? Why not let the group of men who framed the unofficial convention at Saratoga and whose spokesman said, "we will decide what is best for the people and we will give it to them"—why not let this group coalesce with the group that control the opposite party, appoint a man of their choice to act as governor, divide the legislature among themselves, and thereby save all the hubbub and fuss that attends every election, and leave the money that the election would cost in the banks, to the credit of the State? There is as much logic in one suggestion as in the other. The fact of the matter is, that a democratic form of government is an expensive form of government to live under and maintain. To preserve it from the inroads of those who wish to control it and who for that reason wish to turn it into an oligarchy certain safe-

guards are necessary. Whether the expenditures necessary to provide these safeguards are or are not worth while, depends entirely upon whether a democratic government is or is not worth while. If it is not then we all might better forget about it, conserve the news print which is expended on it, and let those who wish to control the government control it without more ado. But if it be worth while, then we must realize that it is an expensive form of government under which to live; that it only can be maintained by expensive protective measures, and make up our minds to pay the price of this species of eternal vigilance in order to maintain it.

WHEREIN LIES THE FAILURE

As to the second excuse for repealing this law, there is a great deal that might be said. In a sense it is a failure in many ways. One way is that the direct primary law has not resulted in putting in office in the State of New York a half dozen men of real intellectual capacity. If we go through the list of office-holders it would be difficult to point to this number of men, or half this number in fact; and this does not exclude the judiciary, who would stand out with their heads above the crowd if they did not happen to hold public office. In fact, New York has been for many years, with very rare exceptions, governed by rather pitiful mediocrity,—mediocrity in intelligence, in attainments, in all things except the backing of the leaders of the political organizations to which they have belonged. This, however, in common with its other failures is not the fault of the direct primary law. It is the fault of those to whose interests it has been to turn this law into a nullity and who have not hesitated to do it. Such leaders do not want either brains, or ability in office. Their one great fear is independence of judgment and of action, for this combination of brains, ability and independence will destroy the throttlehold they have on their organizations and bring about the loss of their control. There are no men in America more short-sighted, more narrow-visioned or more stupid than

these same political leaders. To them the whole matter of politics is but a game, and they judge of their success not by the good that is done for the State by their organizations, but by their own miserable successes and failures in putting over this or that—whether it be men or measures.

WHERE THE VOTERS ARE LAX

It is undoubtedly true that only a small percentage of the electorate takes the trouble to go to the polls at the primary elections. Again, however, this is not the fault of the primary law but rather of the fact that it has been so turned into a sham and a mockery, by those who wished to discredit it, that the average voter has been made to feel that it makes no difference what he does or may do, the organization machine which has dominated for many years will continue to dominate and the result will be the same. During the last year, we have had two primary elections—one for Presidential electors and one for the candidates for State offices. Both were absolute frauds perpetrated on the intelligence of the voter. The organization decided that the Republican delegation from New York to the National Convention should go unpledged; that is, the preferential primary should express no preference. It made no difference that the very object of the primary law was to afford a means by which the electorate could express its wish as to whom it wanted the convention to nominate, and through men of its own selection to have this wish executed. Mr. Barnes *et al.* did not wish it so. Therefore, the voters had an opportunity of going to the polls and voting for one man for each office. It was not for one of two or three men. There was one man (or one group of men) and the voter was told to vote for him or not vote at all. No man, even though his intelligence be on the level of that of the average politician, could arouse within himself any great amount of enthusiasm on that proposition, or would feel that the laws of his State had given him a very wide choice. It is, therefore, not his fault if his interest in the direct primary law as it works in operation is not so fervent and

abiding that he is impatient to exercise his privileges under its provisions.

It is idle to protest on the ground that any one of the candidates could have put a separate ticket in the field of candidates pledged to him. That is a ruinously expensive proposition in the first place, since it would mean an organization in every congressional district in the State and a nomination by petition of his delegates in every such district. It is an altogether unwarranted and unthinkable burden to place on any candidate for office and shows the impossibility, as a practical matter, of contesting the candidates of the organization and thereby frustrating the plans of those who control it for their own purposes.

TO CHEAT THE ELECTORATE OF THEIR RIGHTS

The second primary that was held was for candidates for State officers. Shortly before that primary was held, the organization leaders arranged for what was termed an unofficial convention at Saratoga. The expressed and outright purpose of this convention was to nullify the direct primary law—to cheat the electorate of their privilege of choosing their own candidates for office. The men who called the convention stated openly that,—the laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding,—it was their opinion that the convention method of nominating candidates was better than the primary method, so that they proposed to hold a convention and select the party's candidates. And this is exactly what they did. Is it not a strange coincidence that the men who profited by this open flaunting of the State law and the men who did the flaunting are now the ones to demand the repeal of the primary law on the ground that it does not work? The repeal of this law will aid no one except those who are in office and those who want to control the candidates who run for office. As for the people who should exercise such control, it will deprive them of the last vestige of right to dictate who their candidate shall be.

CLASS GOVERNMENT AND BOLSHEVISM

The growth of Socialism and of Bolshevism throughout the world properly finds its origin in one condition—a government by an irresponsible minority. This is the meaning of the political revolutions of Europe, and the widespread clamor for democratic government throughout the world. People everywhere are demanding a greater voice in the selection of the man or men who rule over them. This is no time to turn back the hands of the clock in this country or in any State of this country and revert to a system of nominations that confines the candidates for office to a list selected through a process of political bossism. This is the most vicious sort of class government. . . It is class government by the unintelligent, by the stupid, by the ignorant. In this respect it is but a step removed from Bolshevism. In principle it is not removed at all, but in method only. When, in the face of present day conditions, we attempt to perpetuate such government, we are merely furnishing an incubator for socialistic demagoguery, a hook on which the soap-box orators can hang their charges against our form of government. Such an attempt is an invitation to revolution, an attempt at suicide.

Simply because a piece of legislation, excellent in theory and conception, does not work is no reason for destroying it. That is a policy of destruction, not of construction. The thing to do, if our legislators are honest in their desire to let our government remain a government of and by the people, is to so remodel the law that it will work. Cut out what is impractical, add what needs to be added and make its enforcement mandatory. A law which Barnes & Company can set aside and nullify as they have done the present primary law, both in the case of the primary for delegates to the National Convention and in the case of the State primary, is no law at all and its existence in that form merely provokes a contempt for all law. It needs revision in two particulars, one to control the political boss, the other to force the citizen to assume the burdens of citizenship at the same time he is taking advantage of its privileges.

The first would make the results of the primary an expression of the preference of the electorate and binding on the delegates. The second would force the citizen to participate in the primary if he desired to participate in the election which followed.

To repeal the law and restore the old power to a convention controlled in its entirety by the organization machine, would be to brand the party that did it not only with ignorant stupidity but as positively and dangerously reactionary.

Prominent Men Give Their Views on the Subject

IN ORDER to obtain a wide and diversified expression of opinion on this exceedingly important question of direct primaries, the Editor of THE FORUM addressed communications to representative men in public and private life, covering essential units in political, professional and business pursuits, requesting them to express their opinions on the subject. The replies have been very gratifying, for, by their clearness and candor, they indicate that deep thought has been given to this debatable problem and that the writers have been willing to freely present their views.

It is to be regretted that lack of space prevents the publication of all the letters in full, but an effort has been made to preserve the spirit of the communications by presenting the salient parts of the correspondents' arguments.

WHY HENRY W. TAFT OPPOSES PRESENT DIRECT PRIMARY LAW

Mr. Henry W. Taft, in a very forceful and positive manner gets directly to the case in point by saying:

"I am opposed to the present direct primary law for the reason that it tends to enthrone the worst type of bosses and the very rich, as the chief power in the nomination of candidates for public office. It pleases the political leaders because it enables them to select candidates in secret and then to use the party organization to secure their nomination. Could we have a more convincing proof of this than

the opposition of Governor Smith and Tammany last year to the repeal of the direct primary law? Theoretically the people are at liberty to oppose candidates selected by the organization, but, practically, they work at a great disadvantage by being forced at a heavy expense and in a hurry to build up an organization which is usually amateurish and ineffective. This is not only demoralizing, but, if successful, its tendency is toward the nomination of undesirable candidates.

"The Fathers wisely considered that ordered civil liberty could be best obtained by the people through the application of the principle of representation. As our population has increased, the necessity for resorting to the representative method also has increased. Under modern conditions, conventions, provided the delegates are fairly selected, respond to public opinion much more readily than individual bosses selecting in secret candidates to be voted for at a primary. A marked instance of this was the effect of public opinion in securing the nomination of Governor Hughes for a second term.

"I would, therefore, restore the State convention; perhaps, also, the convention in some of the smaller political units. Even in the Assembly District it is difficult to bring public opinion into play through the direct primary. Theoretically, the Greek city state and the town meeting in New England afforded the most perfect examples of pure democracy; but the increase in the population, and, I regret to say, to some extent the indifference of the people in performing their political duties, make such democracy impracticable under modern conditions. Other mediums must be devised for the expression of public opinion, and nothing yet has been discovered which is an improvement upon party conventions."

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE THAT DRAFTED THE LAW

Mr. Paul D. Cravath was chairman of the committee of the Union League Club which, in co-operation with Mr. Root, who was then president of the club, drafted the law

that created the first official primary in the State of New York. Mr. Cravath says:

"We devoted considerable attention through hearings and consultation with experienced men from other States to the subject of the nomination of party candidates for public office by direct primary nominations. We reached a conclusion adverse to that system and nothing has since happened to change my view of its unwisdom. I think the system of nominations by convention results in better candidates, less control by political bosses, and in greater influence for the better elements of a party."

United States Senator James W. Wadsworth, Jr., in his usual clear and direct manner gets to the point of the question when he writes:

"I am convinced, as the result of interesting personal experiences and pretty extensive observation, that a system of direct nominations covering a constituency as large as the State of New York, is unnecessarily expensive to the taxpayer, confusing to the enrolled party voter and conducive to a state of affairs in which it becomes increasingly difficult to persuade strong representative men to present themselves as candidates for high public office. The system, when applied to a large constituency, becomes a hit-or-miss affair, liable to control by selfishly-inclined propagandists and by utterly fortuitous circumstances. The great mass of the enrolled voters, in the very nature of things, cannot possibly know much about the qualifications of each of a large number of candidates for a lengthy list of offices. . . . .

"When the direct nominating system was first established, it was confidently asserted by its proponents that it would do away with machine nomination and so-called boss rule. Experience shows that it has utterly failed in this regard and that hundreds of thousands of enrolled voters fail to attend the primary polls and leave to a minority of the enrolled voters the decision as to which of several men, each demanding public office, should be elected."

He believes that the effect of direct nominations upon

the State judiciary is most unfortunate and that the State convention should be restored under the law and be composed of delegates directly elected by the enrolled voters in the primary. He adds:

"I am not prepared to say at this time whether or not we should go any further in restoring delegate conventions. The whole question involves infinite ramifications, some of them very complicated—notably, the nomination of municipal officers in a greater city like New York. The Legislature is entirely competent to solve these problems with wisdom and discretion and I would not propose any hard-and-fast lines from which the Legislature should start or at which it should end changes in the present law."

MESSRS LEVENSON, TABER, RACHE AND BROWN ON THE QUESTION

The experience of Mr. Joseph Levenson while in charge of political activities in a tenement district, where his party is in the minority, is illuminating evidence. This experience, he says, convinces him that "the direct primary is a useless burden which involves great financial cost to the community, to the parties and to the candidates, and it does not act as an incentive to the enrolled party electors to take any special interest in the primary election, without which interest the primary cannot meet the expectations of its advocates and friends." Other objections which he states are: "The direct primary places a premium on racial and religious prejudices. . . . The expense account is enormous and bars men of limited means. . . . The primary election is entirely under the control of the party organization workers. . . . Election district returns with no votes at all or only one or two for the anti-organization candidate are very frequent occurrences."

Interesting also, are the views of another party worker —Mr. John Taber, Chairman of the Republican County Committee of Cayuga County, New York State, who positively writes:

"I think that the present direct primaries have been an

absolute failure in that they tend to increase the expenses of candidates for office, limiting candidates to those who have a considerable amount of money, to increase party strife and dissatisfaction and, as a general rule, result in the selection of the unfit rather than the fit."

Logically he follows out his line of argument and concludes:

"It is much better to have the leaders of the party who have been elected as delegates to a convention meet and perform the functions of a nominating convention than to meet in private, as they are forced to do in the direct primaries, and agree upon a ticket. I would look upon the return to the State Convention as a great step in advance and away from Tammany bungling which we have had to put up with for the last ten years."

Mr. Jules S. Bache, typical of the alert man of business, says in a sentence:

"The reason why I am opposed to the direct primary law is, that, first of all, the people at large do not, under present conditions, have a proper opportunity of expressing their choice, being merely given the choice of voting for individuals put in nomination by themselves or their particular factions in the party; but, above all, because it adds to the expenses of the individual candidates."

Mr. William Grant Brown, looking at the matter from the mind of the experienced lawyer and politician says:

"It is not a change in the law that the leaders want. It is a repeal of the law and a return to the convention system. I made it my business to talk with a great many of the leaders of the Saratoga Convention and I am satisfied that nearly all the leaders want to return to the old system. The law requires amendment and these amendments should be made in an effort to improve the present law—not to repeal it, and thereby safeguard the primary step in representative government. If this law is repealed and the convention system rehabilitated, a movement will be started in the electoral reform that will most certainly and definitely accomplish the purposes of those who fathered the direct

primary movement in its conception. The most effective thing that could be done to foster radical recruiting would be to repeal the direct primary law."

EPHEMERÆ

By J. CORSON MILLER

We spun Life's thread upon Love's shining loom,
Before Youth's noontide waned to evenfall;
The world for us was like a golden room,
Where roses laughed, and dreams held carnival.

We drank new raptures where Romance had clung,—
Soul unto soul—mysterious and wise;
Our nights were towers with silver windows hung,
Lit up with joy that streamed from fairy-eyes.

Our days were symphonies that beat in tune
Along old summer-paths of green delight;
Until a cloud blew cold across the Moon,
And Life became a dark and bitter night.

Do stars dance down, where now no angels sing?
Nay, we but knock at Love's deserted door;
Long since we heard Love's music in the Spring—
Our dreams are dead leaves strewn about the floor,
For us the Faries' windows flame no more.

THE NEGRO'S ASPIRATIONS

By A. L. JACKSON

THE crux of any problem of better adjustment in racial relationship is education. While it is very true that the education of Negroes has been looked upon as the ultimate way out, today most close students of the problem regard the education of white Americans as the program for achieving real results. This is not to suggest any let-up in the attempt to afford black Americans every opportunity for training and education enjoyed by other Americans. But as racial clashes multiply and bitterness and misunderstanding increase, it becomes increasingly evident that the education of white men and women is equally important if the ideal of American democracy is to be fully demonstrated to the world as one that is practicable for all men and all times as we so fondly claim. To many students it sometimes appears as if the Negro would be the rock upon which the good ship Democracy will founder unless more judgment and common sense is shown by the people in the pilot-house.

The race problem is by no means a popular topic today. Perhaps that is because what is largely an economic and psychological problem has been erroneously termed a race problem. It is certainly true that whereas a generation ago it was comparatively easy to find many people who were considered friends of the Negro, today, outside of the relatively small circle of trustee boards of schools and colleges directing their attention to the education and training of Negroes or a few religious or welfare organizations with similar objectives, it is somewhat difficult to find any large

number of white people who, because of their familiarity with the various problems which Negroes face, or fair-minded attitude toward them, can be called friends of the Negro with any degree of certainty. Of course there are thousands who write checks annually for some worthy school or organization which is properly sponsored by the right people; but too often the interest does not follow the check. Few people have any conception of what the colored people, or Afro-Americans, or Negroes, or whatever you may choose to call them, are thinking or doing today or what they purpose to do tomorrow.

Wherever you do find people showing an interest, you will usually find that they may be classed roughly in three groups:

PEOPLE THE NEGRO INTERESTS

First, those who are contributors to some Southern Negro school in which their family or friends have been interested since the Civil War days. These people are usually of the conservative substantial class who support most missionary enterprises. It is certainly true that but for them there would have been few or no opportunities for Negroes to secure any training or education worthy of the name during the past fifty years. Except in the case of those devoted souls who gave their lives in the South as teachers of Negroes, few of these people had any direct first-hand knowledge of Negroes and their lives. Those missionary teachers are disappearing today with few successors taking their places. The interest of their friends and children is largely a matter of family tradition in a distant and not especially well understood situation. Rarely are the members of this group more familiar with this question in their home communities or interested in the home situation.

The second group is composed of those forward-looking people who on questions relating to their own group are looked upon as meddlers, reformers or radicals. These people rightly believe that the causes and reforms in which they are interested cannot attain their objectives completely un-

less the interests of the Negro group are duly considered and taken care of in their plans and programs. Many times when more conservative persons who are asked to take an interest in enterprises for the advancement and betterment of Negroes find members of this group actively identified with the enterprise, they are unwilling to pull in the same harness with these people on account of a difference of opinion or point of view on other questions. They forget that the very fact that these people are pioneers and leaders in causes which for the moment may be considered unpopular or ill-timed makes it easier and more natural for them to espouse the cause of the Negro, which in American public opinion belongs in that general classification. From the point of view of the Negro himself, the conversion of any white man or woman regardless of his or her other interests to an intelligent understanding and support of his cause and projects is a point gained in the education of the white majority group. He is not in a position to pick and choose his friends. He must accept them as he finds them as long as they are right on "*the* question" which is his chief concern.

The third and smaller group is made up of those who have known some Negro in school or college days or in some other chance relationship and been favorably impressed by that individual Negro. They are ready to concede that there are exceptional Negroes; but a bit hesitant about transferring their faith to the group which they represent. Wherever that individual Negro is able to keep in touch with the members of this group, a friendly interest is maintained and sometimes stimulated for other things involving the welfare of the Negro group. This relationship always serves as a stimulus to the faith of individual Negroes in the white group despite discouraging and bitter experiences which daily tend to break down that faith. So almost without exception this class of Negroes believes that if by some means the average fair-minded white man or woman could be rightly educated and informed there would be a better day for all concerned. He is the one remaining bulwark standing against the onslaught of the "black man first," "African

Empire," spokesman who has lost or never had that confidence and faith in the American spirit of fair-play when applied to black men and women.

THE SHIBBOLETH OF WHITE SUPERIORITY

The tragedy of most of the race riots of recent years in Northern cities has been the difficulty of finding those among the substantial right-minded citizens who were sufficiently well informed and courageous enough intelligently to undertake the task of working with the leading Negro citizens to quell disorders and lawlessness and save the good name of the community.

Too many white boys and girls have been wrongly educated to maintain the shibboleth of white superiority by feeling and expressing a disdain and contempt for Negroes and all that they represent. From disdain and contempt to hatred and oppression is but a very short step. In many instances parents have allowed their children to grow up in ignorance of the very important and worthy place which Negroes have had in developing America and safe-guarding her most cherished ideals and traditions. These children have grown into manhood and womanhood with only such information about their darker fellow countrymen as they have been able to acquire from newspaper headlines about Negro criminals or from black-face comedians and minstrel shows or from the ill-concealed prejudices of their mis-educated friends and playmates. This has led to a steadfast adherence in principle and practice to the theory that the American white man is a superior being, "Therefore the Negro is inferior." It is, of course, perfectly obvious that an inferior has no rights which superiors are bound to respect or ambitions which are justified in running counter to the ideas which his superiors have as to his place and limitations in the general scheme of things.

So that today there are in any community comparatively few young men and women among the white group who have any real idea of the Negro and his possibilities or ac-

complishments or any special desire to see him win a place for himself in our life and civilization according to his merit. Young Negro men and women have been so hedged about by limitations and restrictions, oppression, prejudice and hatred until they are loathe to believe that the boasted American tradition of fair play and an even break exists anywhere but in the imagination of the patriotic holiday orator. Herein lies the greatest danger of a situation already fraught with many hazards. When one group is compelled to develop a separate civilization and set of institutions founded on race pride, which is hedged about by race misunderstanding and ignorance, race hatred is the logical outcome. The things which under normal circumstances would amount to little more than healthy rivalry and competition between different groups or individuals, under these conditions become veiled or open racial contests and conflicts. Glenn Warner, the noted football coach, commenting upon the Indian football teams which he coached so successfully for many years, has this to say:

> "The Indians were different in many ways from white college boys . . . . college boys are imbued with an intense college spirit in their big games which helps the coach a great deal. The Carlisle boys did not show this same spirit except upon occasions when they met another Indian team. When playing against college teams, it was not to them so much the Carlisle School against Pennsylvania or Harvard, as the case might be, but it was the Indian against the White Man.
>
> "They did not manifest a school spirit but did have a racial spirit. They seemed to recognize the fact that it was upon the athletic field that the Indians had an even chance against their white brothers, and they wanted to show that given an even chance they were the equals of their pale-face brothers. It was that spirit that urged them to supreme efforts, and to defeat some of the very best university teams, although greatly outweighed and pitted against men whose minds were much more highly developed than their own."

HANDICAPPED BY RACIAL PREJUDICE

As with the Indian so has it been with the Negro. In most every field of endeavor his demonstrations of ability

and fitness have had to be on a racial basis. He has had no other choice. Therefore, many achievements by Negro men and women have been to him not so much accomplishments of talented individuals, but racial accomplishments refuting the constantly repeated assertion of pre-ordained inferiority.

For generations the Negro has been looked upon as a predestined tiller of the soil. Any effort to break down this notion was frowned upon. So he tilled the soil in an effort to satisfy ignorant and unscientific overseers and plantation owners, until the day came when, following the advice of wiser men, he began acquiring his own land. Today more than 220,000 Negroes are owners of their own farms; 672,-964 are renters or share croppers looking forward to the day when they will be owners; $492,892,218 worth of farm-building stock and equipment are owned by these tillers of the soil. But what was to become of the young men and women who would not remain on the land whether they owned it or not? For them in the Southern towns and Northern cities only the most menial positions were open. In the main they were blind-alley jobs as domestic or personal servants in homes, hotels or barber shops. Some of the more venturesome took to the railroads as Pullman porters where they had their first real chance to observe the industrial and manufacturing development of the country. Still there was no place for them. The immigrant laborer was a too favored competitor for unskilled work and the written and unwritten law of labor unions shut the Negro out from skilled work as apprentice or mechanic.

Undaunted he kept pressing forward seeking training, education and experience wherever they were to be found. In the face of every discouragement he has progressed until there is hardly a single avenue of endeavor in the arts or sciences in which he has not made his mark.

Today Paul Lawrence Dunbar is beloved wherever the dialect poem is read or known. William Stanley Braithwaite, a Negro poet, each year decides authoritatively the question of poetry of merit for the Boston *Transcript* "Anthology." Probably the best known painter in the

world today of scriptural subjects is Henry O. Tanner, who was born in Pittsburgh and received his early training in Philadelphia schools. The contribution of the Negro to American music is undisputed. His is *the* American music. As an inventor nearly 1500 patents have been granted to Negroes, some of them having an important part in our most useful mechanical and industrial appliances in service today. The list of his accomplishments is much too long to cover here but is of sufficient length and breadth to convince the most skeptical person who will face and study the facts.

WHAT THE "NEW" NEGRO IS DOING

Today we hear a good deal about the new Negro. It is not so much a new Negro we face today as an awakened Negro. He has been doing his best to follow the doctrine of self-help to the limit. From his own resources he has organized what he calls, for lack of a better name, race business and enterprises, until today most of his professional services are supplied by his own kind—Negro physicians, trained nurses, lawyers, clergymen and school teachers. Banks, insurance companies, real-estate firms and other businesses have multiplied with him during the past few years. Fifty thousand Negroes are engaged in two hundred different kinds of businesses. The total volume of these enterprises amounts to about one and a quarter billions of dollars per year. It is estimated that Negro insurance companies annually write more than $40,000,000 worth of insurance among their clients. Just prior to the war seventy-two banks, capitalized at two and a half million dollars, were doing an annual business of $35,000,000. These figures are indicative of the slow, persistent advance of a minority group combating prejudice, misunderstanding and indifference.

Then came the war. Over 300,000 strong he marched to the colors to save the world for a democracy that he knew little of except by hearsay or had seen operate only for the good of the other fellow. When Northern industries found that the wheels of their gigantic enterprises were not turn-

ing rapidly enough for lack of hands, a half million pairs of willing hands came forward to fill the places of the immigrant and semi-skilled and skilled mechanics. In the iron foundries, in the great steel mills, in the railroad shops, in the shipyards, in the packing plants, he had his first real chance to demonstrate his ability to meet the requirements of highly organized and high-speed industries. Here were no pro-German spies or propagandists. Here were no traitors, wilful slackers, skilled in sabotage. On the contrary, here were willing loyal patriots willing to forgive and forget their own oppression and wrongs, firm in their belief in the Stars and Stripes and all that the Constitution said they stood for. As in every war since the Revolution the Negro came forward hoping and believing that this time, when the tumult and the shouting died, U. S. would really spell US.

What does he face today? Many hopeful signs to be sure; but many sinister omens and portents. In the South, the scene of his hopes and his early oppression, he finds what had heretofore seemed hopeless a small and growing body of Southern white men reaching out openly to know the truth of his complaints and ambitions; seeking to know him better and make themselves known. Some doubted their eyes. Some still doubt. But for the first time a successful attempt has been made to get Southern white men to sit down with colored men determined to know the facts. I quote from a public deliverance of the Southern University Race Commission, a body of Southern university professors who are staking out the road for others to follow who will:

> "The world-wide reconstruction that is following in the wake of the war will necessarily affect the South in a peculiar way. Nearly 300,000 Negroes have been called into the military service of the country; many thousands more have been drawn from peaceful pursuits into industries born of the war; and several hundred thousands have shifted from the South to the industrial districts of the North. The demobilization of the army and the transition of industry from a war to a peace basis are creating many problems which can be solved only by the efforts of both races. The Negro in adapting himself to the new conditions should have the wise sympathy and generous co-operation of his white

neighbors. A wider degree of co-operation between the best elements is to the interest of these, as well as of the Negro himself, that readjustment should proceed with the least possible difficulty and delay.

"We believe that this readjustment may be effectively aided by a more general appreciation of the Negro's value as a member of the community. Lack of sympathy and understanding between two groups of people frequently cause one group to regard the shortcomings of a few individuals of the other as characteristic of all that group. This is a natural tendency but it is neither rational nor just, and it has proved, we believe, one of the great obstacles to the development of more satisfactory racial relations in this country."

RAYS OF HOPE DOWN SOUTH

In some Southern communities, white men are taking the lead with their new-found Negro friends to abate some of the strictures under which their Negro laborers and citizens work, travel and attempt to play. Here and there some voices are being lifted up in warning and reproach to thoughtless and prejudiced oppressors. Those voices are all too few, but there are some where but yesterday there were none. These signs give some ray of hope where hope is much needed to flog a waning faith into new life.

And yet there are far too many clouds in the horizon. The Ku-Klux Klan and all it stands for still finds many eager, misguided followers today. It is difficult to uproot the ignorance, prejudice and suspicion of generations. Race prejudice and race-pride have done their work well. There stands facing America today 12,000,000 Negroes wanting to give to their fellows a confidence and trust which they dare not give because of the record of neglect, exploitation and oppression. Some three hundred Negro newspapers persistently preach to them the doctrine of self-trust and self-sufficiency. These men and women ask of America but one thing for which bygone generations gave their lives—a fair chance and an even break. They have proven their loyalty and ability in every walk of American life. They have the right to feel and know that if immigrants from foreign

shores who know neither the language nor the ideals of this country can come to us confident of finding a place for themselves and their children, that they who are Americans by birthright are to have a man's chance to better the condition of themselves and their children according to their innate merit and ability.

This means for young white Americans that they must shake off the apathy, ignorance and mistaken notions of their predecessors. As they assume positions of influence and leadership in American life and industry, it must be with a determination that the motto "America first" must apply to all Americans, black or white.

The average American school, college or university offers an ideal opportunity for the right education of young Americans on this question. There are to be found the future jurists, newspaper editors, business men and political statesmen. Whether they like it or not, sometime in their careers they will run into this bugaboo race question. It will not be a bugaboo if their ideas have been rightly formed early enough. They ought to be able to face it intelligently without passion or malice. Every educational institution in this country could well afford to plan each year to have successful intelligent Negroes present to their student bodies the plain unadulterated facts about the problem of racial relationships from the Negro point of view. These young men and women, full of the will to do, simply do not know the facts and are offered no opportunity to acquire them. They seldom if ever see a Negro newspaper or magazine. They never enter the homes of intelligent Negroes. They rarely see the Negro except in a servile capacity where his daily bread depends upon his ability to please the people he serves.

It is, therefore, little wonder that the average white man or woman thinks of Negroes in terms of their maid or manservant. To be sure hotel employees and railroad porters have done much to change the notions of some of the American public; but it is hardly possible to visualize the civilization which is truly representative of Switzerland, let us

say, solely through the eyes of the very estimable fellow who just happens to serve you at table at your favorite club or hotel.

POPULAR IGNORANCE ABOUT NEGRO

I shall never forget the result of my own attempts to help students see the way clear in this matter. It has been my privilege to talk to many white students. Always the response has been the same. They did not have the slightest conception of the handicaps and limitations which American public opinion has put upon Negroes, or what the effect of these limitations was on the life of the race or the country. They were eager to know, to ask questions, to receive suggestions about their own responsibility and relationship to the whole question. I found a principal of a leading school seriously agitated about the presence of one Negro boy in a school of over five hundred white students. From the beganning Negro students had made good records in the life of that school. Yet this man who is one of the finest characters and educators in the country was so muddled in his thinking that he lost for a little while all sight of his responsibility not only to that lone Negro boy but to his four hundred and ninety-nine schoolmates whose opinions about Negroes for the rest of their lives would be shaped and colored by that one rare opportunity to meet and know one Negro under normal circumstances and in ordinary situations. Here then is our opportunity to decrease misunderstanding, abolish ignorance and destroy hatred by educating the younger white generation by putting before them the facts. The truth shall make them free! Then to future generations will be given broad statesmen, intelligent leaders and responsible citizens who will see right and justice done because they will know when and how best to do it.

Negro labor is the only labor in this country which has been allowed to go untrained and untutored for larger, better and more skilled production. It will respond to sane sympathetic direction and leadership. It will meet fair play with fair dealing and loyalty. It must be used and

used to the utmost for the full development of the resources of this country be they material or spiritual. The Negro asks only to be treated as other men are treated. That treatment will not be accorded to him until the public opinion of America is educated to know him as he is in every community where he lives.

Gone are the days when any one Negro or small group of Negroes can be looked upon as his appointed or chosen shepherds. In every community are Negro men and women who are capable and willing and inevitably must assume the responsibilities of leadership for the group which they represent just as the more responsible clear-thinking men and women in any other group assume it. To function effectively for the good of the community these men and women must have a close and constant affiliation with every other force which makes progress and usefulness in that community. No housing problem is solved unless the housing problem of Negroes is solved with it. There will be no better babies for anybody unless Negro babies are helped and improved. Laboring men can only go forward as all other laborers go forward, black or white. The best production record is not reached until the Negro is made a better producer. The consumer's market is not fully captured until the needs of Negro consumers are satisfied.

Last but most important American democracy is not proven as a vital enduring workable ideal until it has really embraced and included all men of all races. America has yet to demonstrate to the world that her experiment will really work. That demonstration will not be complete until the American Negro can say a hearty amen to it.

SARA TEASDALE'S POEMS

By MARGUERITE WILKINSON

THE task of the maker of lyrics is self-revelation; but what self shall be revealed, and how? A poet may look into his own mind as a careful housewife looks into a piece-bag and choose from what he finds there a bit of shimmering loveliness which he will fashion into a poem. Such a poet is a selective artist, a revealer of the self that William Butler Yeats calls "antithetical" because it triumphs over the commonplace self of every day. Until the time of Whitman this was the way of the makers of lyrics. But Whitman wanted to tell the whole story of the natural man. He gave what was nearest, cheapest, and easiest with what was remote and costly and difficult. He has been followed by others who lack the sheer greatness which makes us forgive his sins, philosophical and aesthetic, and who, without realizing his great desire to show mankind the sublimity of the commonplace, bore us with garrulous trivialities and shock us with wild sensations, the red flags of spiritual anarchy. Like hasty housewives, they turn the piece-bag upside down upon the floor of the world. They would give us all of themselves. They are too generous.

For this reason it is a relief as well as a joy to read Sara Teasdale's lyrics. She is a selective artist. If she has known weakness, she has given strength; if she has known darkness, she has given light; if she has known anguish, she has given peace. She has kept to the highway of life where George Edward Woodberry says we shall find all genius of the first rank, "not turning aside to the eccentric, the sensational, the abnormal, the brutal, the base," but realizing that "life-experience spiritualized is the formula of all great literature." It is the highest self, the antithetical self, that she re-

veals, the self that we long to find and share. She bows before no grotesque idols at any shrine of ugliness. She worships the truth and beauty which Keats thought were one, and sufficient for us here. She can say,

"And though I must give my breath
And my laughter all to death,
And my eyes through which joy came,
And my heart, a wavering flame;
If all must leave me and go back
Along a blind and fearful track
So that you can make anew,
Fusing with intenser fire
Something nearer your desire;
If my soul must go alone
Through a cold infinity,
Or even if it vanish, too,
Beauty, I have worshiped you."

Beauty has been more to Sara Teasdale than a desire or a belief. It has been a discipline and a growth. Her five books are like ascending terraces on the side of that mountain whose summit, the absolute beauty, no mortal can ever reach. For her there has been, as yet, no spiritual or artistic retrograde. To realize this it is necessary only to read the books in sequence.

Sonnets To Duse" (1907) was unimportant as poetry and is interesting now only as a promise that the mature poet has made and kept. But in it the first step toward beauty is taken. The sonnets are a record of youth's admiration for beauty achieved. They are not in any sense personal, for when they were written the young poet had not met the great actress.

"Helen of Troy" (Putnam, 1911) is much more important. It won cordial praise when it appeared. Indeed, it was the ideal book of critics of the period, being very conventional in substance, thought, feeling and manner. The monologues with which it begins, however, are a sufficient excuse for the enthusiasm of critics. They describe scenes in the lives of Helen, Guinevere, Beatrice, and other great

ladies out of history. Into the mouths of these paragons the poet puts emotions which she is not yet ready to express in terms of her own experience, but which she has imagined and felt intuitively as a part of the beauty of these lives of long ago. She is no longer content to pay homage to beauty. She must share it through sympathy. These monologues are written in blank verse of rare sweetness and distinction. In one of them Sappho is made to say,

> "There is a quiet at the heart of love
> And I have pierced the pain and come to peace.
> I hold my peace, my Cleis, on my heart;
> And softer than a little wild bird's wing
> Are kisses that she pours upon my mouth."

The lyrics that follow the monologues express the modes of girlhood, thoughts and feelings that any young woman of good breeding might share. The meters are neat and tightly wrought, the language always conventional, sometimes even "literary."

"Helen of Troy" is a book of youth. "Rivers To The Sea" (Macmillan, 1915) is a book of womanhood. In it we find a new and golden strength, a new and silvery simplicity. In it the poet no longer speaks through the lips of history. Life has given her deep emotions of her own. Her rhythms move to the tunes of her own life; her thoughts shape themselves to their own images. Here is candor in self-revelation. Here is intimate speech made musical. Here is a search for the secret of the relation of the individual soul to beauty.

> "Oh, beauty are you not enough?
> Why am I crying after love,
> With youth, a singing voice, and eyes
> To take earth's wonder with surprise?"

"Rivers To The Sea" and "Love Songs" (Macmillan, 1917) may be said to bring the poet to her emotional maturity. Some of the poems included in "Love Songs" were previously found in the earlier books, but in the new ones we find a new development of the thought of beauty, the idea

that beauty can be brought out of any of life's experiences and is the essential core of the core of life itself. It is always to be desired, the eternal city of refuge.

"From my spirit's gray defeat,
From my pulse's flagging beat,
From my hopes that turned to sand
Sifting through my close-clenched hand,
From my own fault's slavery,
If I can sing, I still am free.

"For with my singing I can make
A refuge for my spirit's sake,
A house of shining words to be
My fragile immortality."

And again she says:

"Spend all you have for loveliness,
Buy it and never count the cost;
For one white singing hour of peace
Count many a year of strife well lost,
And for a breath of ecstasy
Give all you have been or could be."

When Sara Teasdale wrote "Rivers To The Sea" and "Love Songs" she earned an honorable place among American poets. But "Flame And Shadow" (Macmillan, 1920) surpasses them by as much as they surpass "Helen of Troy." It is the book of her intellectual maturity. It shows clearly that her mind, moving up through history, evolving much as the race has evolved, has come abreast of her own times.

One critic has said that her poetry has the quality of timelessness, that it could have been written a hundred years ago and that it will be read a hundred years hence. He may be right. The emotions expressed could be shared by mankind in any period, and the beauty which she has loved may be immortal. Her lyrics are unique personal variations of universal melodies, of the music of yesterday, to-day and forever.

"Sun-swept beaches with a light wind blowing
From the immense blue circle of the sea,
And the soft thunder where long waves whiten—
These were the same for Sappho as for me.

"Two thousand years—much has gone by forever,
Change takes the gods and ships and speech of men—
But here on the beaches that time passes over
The heart aches now as then."

But in spite of all that, I do not think that "Flame And Shadow" could have been written by any woman of long ago. The emotions and the beauty in it are eternal verities, perhaps, but Sara Teasdale is aware of the changes that take the gods and ships and speech of men. Side by side with "Flame And Shadow" on my desk is "The Oxford Book of English Verse." Here is her artistic ancestry. Here are emotions like hers, beauty loved as she has loved it. But where are the thoughts that run parallel to her thoughts? Certainly not in work of the Elizabethans, those beloved makers of perfect lyrics. Raleigh dreams of an Elysium—

"There will I kiss
The bowl of bliss
And drink mine everlasting fill
Upon every milken hill.
My soul will be a-dry before;
But after, it will thirst no more."

The sweetness of such simple faith is lost to many of the moderns. Sara Teasdale may cry out of a full heart

"Life is my lover—I shall leave the dead
If there is any way to baffle death."

The strong ego in her may refuse to take cognizance of a universe in which it can not live and love forever. But the current assurances of immortality have not satisfied her intellect. All that does satisfy her is the belief that man can triumph through the realization of beauty even though he must face annihilation. Against the shadow of death she sets the flame of beauty. This philosophy is to be found in many poems, but is most fully expressed in "The Wind In The Hemlock" in these lines:

"With envious dark rage I bear,
Stars, your cold complacent stare;
Heart-broken in my hate look up,
Moon, at your clear immortal cup,

Changing to gold from dusky red—
Age after age when I am dead
To be filled up with light, and then
Emptied, to be refilled again.

"If I am peaceful, I shall see
Beauty's face continually;
Feeding on her wine and bread
I shall be wholly comforted,
For she can make one day for me
Rich as my lost eternity."

Doubt is no new thing under the sun, of course. But this answer to doubt, I think, is modern.

Another lyric in which modernity is even more keenly felt is "The Voice" in which Sara Teasdale epitomizes the whole theory of evolution. I know of no other poem in which it has been as well done.

"Atoms as old as stars,
Mutation on mutation,
Millions and millions of cells
Dividing, yet still the same,
From air and changing earth,
From ancient Eastern rivers,
From turquoise tropic seas,
Unto myself I came."

The poem moves on to a fine climax in the lines

"Forever
Seek for Beauty, she only
Fights with man against Death."

"Flame And Shadow" is not only the book of a fearless modern intellect; it is the book of a mature and wise craftsman. The rhythms of these poems swing free of the small rules of rhetorics that they may obey great laws of the body and mind. They are true to the emotions which they accompany. They move as gracefully as willow branches in a wind. They have unusual mnemonic value. Put them into the mind and the mind moves with them. "Water Lilies" and "The Long Hill" are masterpieces of rhythmical speech. Emotionally, intellectually, artistically, "Flame And Shadow" is a noble book.

There are great ranges of emotion that Sara Teasdale has never explored. The plain things of the folk she does not know intimately. The common hardships of life, toil, poverty, the utilitarian effort, leave no mark upon her work by which we might be aware of them in her life. She is an individualist and feels life individually, rather than racially as most women feel it. The homeliness and stark tragedy of certain passages in "A Shropshire Lad" are beyond her reach.

It is interesting to know that critics have often compared her lyrics with those of Mr. Housman. I have been told that "Sara Teasdale would have been quite impossible if A. E. Housman had not come first." As a matter of fact, she never read "A Shropshire Lad" until after her own thought and craftsmanship were well developed. The comparison is natural, however, for though Housman is a most masculine poet, and Sara Teasdale most feminine, both have given the world lyrics remarkable for poignant feeling, courageous sincerity and vivid simplicity.

There are, as I have said, great ranges of thought and feeling that she does not know, and perhaps will never know. It does not matter. She is a poet capable of queenly discretion, sharing exquisitely and honestly all that life gives her. There are reserves and inhibitions even in her intimacy with sun and rain. But we are content that it should be so. The flame of beauty which she guards and tends does not burn upon a hearth and is not blown by wild and vigorous winds. It lights an altar.

A SHELF OF NEW BOOKS

By GABRIEL S. YORKE

IN twenty-three centuries the movement of thought has but swung the full circle. Such is the general lesson of the history of political theories." With these words Professor William Archibald Dunning closes what he calls the last—we wish he had said the latest—of a series of volumes on the history of political theories. This, his third, "Political Theories from Rousseau to Spencer" (Macmillan) closes a study which begins with an examination of what the Greeks reasoned out on the great question of government and ends arbitrarily with the "permanent" ideas extant in the year 1880. We say arbitrarily because in his introduction Professor Dunning makes it very clear that such was his purpose.

Few books have been written within recent years that might be read with more profit by statesmen, reformers and the general electorate. Whereas the two earlier volumes of the series were hard reading, more or less because they dealt with the dead past, this one has a life and vigor because the age-old problems with which it deals appear in the familiar forms in which they are encountered in the daily press and current magazines.

The studious statesman desiring to check himself up will find in this volume the background and essentials of any problem he may be facing. The reformer, if he read without prejudice, will see the futility of the doctrine of morality by statute. And the wearied public will see to what a great extent the removal of many of the irritations connected with government lies in its own hands.

"Anarchistic individualism," says the author, "was preached by Sophists and Cynics." (Anti-vaccinationists

please note) "Constitutionalism by Aristotle and the other conservative upholders of the *nomoi.*" (Mr. Root please note.) "Nationalism is but the theory of the city-state writ large." (Mr. De Valera please note.) "Societarianism has never been more completely formulated than by Plato." (This is for Messrs. Anderson and Bowlby and the whole populations of Kansas and North Dakota.)

It must not be construed that Professor Dunning's volume consists of his personal observations. What he has done, really, is to take up one by one the important political philosophers from the late XVIIIth century to the forenoon of our own day and in as few words as possible has given the whole gist of their thoughts, whilst at the same time he traces in continuous lines the greater doctrines of the XIXth Century. Those who would seek an explanation of the extraordinary workings of the German mind during the Great War or who are desirous of learning how American thought on Government has changed from the time of the passing of the first Ten Constitutional Amendments to that of the Eighteenth will find what they want in this work.

At the time the Government was floating the first Liberty Loan there appeared in a farm paper of a certain Western State, an editorial which demonstrated the uselessness of trying to raise $3,000,000,000 "because there is not that much money in circulation in America."

Unfortunately, such ignorance is far too prevalent still, although liberty loans and rapid economic changes have done much to familiarize the general public with much which, after all, is elementary of the science of money. For this reason the appearance of a new edition of "Money and Banking" (Appleton) by John Thom Holdsworth, is very welcome.

The very many friends which previous editions won for this author among business men and students will find the present one even more useful than its predecessors.

Like the latter, the new edition covers the history, principles and practices of money, credit and banking in a complete, concise and very readable form. And in addition it

covers the Amendments to the Federal Reserve Act down through 1920 and the many important changes in the country's financial fabric which have been produced by the war.

There are two reasons why Holdsworth has been so successful with his series of editions; as Vice-president of the Bank of Pittsburgh he has had practical experience with his subject and as former Dean of the School of Economics of the University of Pittsburgh he has learned how it ought to be taught.

Aside from the value of the latest edition for the way in which it clarifies all the elements of a science most difficult for the layman, it merits the attention of the professional financier as well by the very timely discussion of the value of money and prices. His empirical discussion of this phase of his subject fits so exactly as a description of the financial history of the past ninety days that one would think he had written *ex post facto* instead of previous to October first.

Closely allied with the Holdsworth book is another called "Problems in Foreign Exchange" (Appleton) by Martin J. Shugrue. This work is not as elementary as Holdsworth's yet it is of inestimable value to the tyro in foreign exchange. One who will first take up "Foreign Exchange Explained" by Escher and who will then go through Shugrue's book with a pencil and pad whilst he does so will be a tyro no longer.

After a short survey of his subject the author takes up one hundred and ten problems in it which the reader is left to work out. These problems will be found by the average importer, exporter or banker to cover about all that he will meet with in the course of a year's experience.

Glib statements on the financial ills of the day are heard so frequently that it is with pleasure that one finds such problems as this:

> "It has been stated that irrespective of the imports and exports of European countries, exchange rates on the United States cannot return to par until Europe has resumed the redemption of her paper money in gold at par.
>
> "Criticize the reasoning in this statement."

There are many who will read this and other of the problems in the book who ought to have read it before buying rubles and marks.

And here is one which shows why Mr. Ponzi is where he is:

> "A New York bank has drawn a ninety days' sight bill on London for which it must remit at once. With New York cable transfers on London selling at $4.76 and London cables selling in Paris at 27.50 francs per pound sterling, what is the highest rate the New York bank can afford to pay in New York for exchange on Paris to be used there for purchasing the required London cables?"

The problems on arbitrage are, in fact, among the best in the book.

Olga Hartley in a novel called *Anne* (Lippincott) introduces a very young lady of that name whose character is at once unique and natural. At the age of fifteen she finds herself confronted by a youthful male guardian, Guilbert Trevor, who has become such by acknowledging a gambling debt which is held against his grandfather's estate. Previously and thereafter in spite of this guardianship, she is "mothered" by another young man, John Halliday, friend of her father, journalist, idealist and unfortunate. The working out of her relationships with these two provides a most interesting story, well told and tender. Primarily it is one of character delineation. Were Anne less introspective she would best be described as a wilful imp.

The author puts her through a series of very human trials, however, that purge her of all that is petty. Acquaintance with Halliday is a pleasure. Minor characters that enter and leave the scene are very neatly defined with a few deft strokes by the author who does not pile on either when dealing with tragic or comic episodes, so that the reader is spared harrowings and boredom.

THE EDITORIAL TABLE

Shall We Trade With Outlaws?

CZARISM was a puerile and inarticulate voice in comparison to Sovietism in the cloak of popular government in Russia today. Except for the heralded influence of its reactions upon socialism in Germany and the self-constituted leaders of agitated masses in Europe and the United States, the absurdity of the opportunist dictatorship could not be viewed seriously by well-informed students of history. The whole fabric of so called Nationalism is fallacious and unsound. It is based upon the supposition of the absolute equality of the mental and physical homogeneity of all mankind. Stalking in the garb of idealism, of a lifting up and a levelling down, Sovietism is, in reality, an attempt to enforce a rule of living utterly at variance with the laws of Nature and human aspirations. In its momentary dictatorship, we behold emaciated science and art, starving and in rags, while an overwhelming body of "officials," go about well clothed and over-fed. We behold the normal channels of domestic trade sealed by "government" order while the erstwhile palaces of royalty and nobility are turned into public store-houses, soup kitchens, military and official headquarters for a dictatorship that pales the palmy sway of Napoleonic heights. We see the currency of a nation valueless and the peasantry burying the product of their toil, in defiance of the Soviet collectors.

The government of Lenine and Trotsky is an outlaw government and the civilization of the world should so declare it. To barter with bandits and outlaws is to encourage them in their continuance and to give legitimacy to their calling. The press of America and Europe is filled with contradictory and half-told truths of conditions within the Russian Empire. The fallacies of Sovietism are spread over the

land by "escaping" refugees, and "honored guests." The world knows enough of the truth of the Bolshevist conquest over the ignorant and helpless peasant and worker of the Slav kingdom; knows that the débâcle is not the result of the people's will, but a transient evolution; a chaotic interim of a people left by war without a government, and awaiting a war to reassert itself. In the recess we have the spectacle of a pretender, a demagogue preaching equality of man and superimposing by a Red Army a dictatorship over a helpless mass, impoverished, decimated and disorganized.

The only power on earth that can perpetuate, even for a time, the monstrous farce at Moscow is outside recognition—a letting down of the world blockade, a toleration in trade interests, of an incompetent and utterly unrepresentative government, the government of Lenine and Trotsky. The nationalization scheme of unbalanced and unsound egotism, must be placed incommunicado with civilization, or through the opened ports of trade the virus will creep out and poison the healthy and progressive advance of world progress. Pro-Germanists have set up the bugaboo of a break-down in Germany—a weakening to the theories and curse of Bolshevism, if France is not crushed. France is at the Marne of Bolshevism, she was at the Somme, undaunted and ready to pour her last drop of blood in the cause of civilization. She today stands unafraid of Russia. Defiant of Germany, and ready to carry on—she has the best trained army in the world. As for the United States, we have spoken. Let us keep out of Russia. Let only the hand of charity cross the Baltic. The sealed door is Russia's salvation. Open it and the terror of the mock government will become a second terror to the world.

On the Eve of a New Regime

The nation is waiting for Harding. Congress is investigating, talking and gathering data, but will fiddle, until the new President and the new cabinet comes in. Senator Harding's characteristics are being studied by the politicians,

business and financial interests. His is the policy of the Romans, hasten slowly; his is the way of thoroughness. Emergency measures do not find lodgment in his mental processes. "Idealism" and "paternalism," will take a back seat in the incoming Administration. Radicalism and experimentation will find no favor in the eyes of the new President. Our foreign policy waits. What part we shall play in Europe is problematical. Undoubtedly we shall have a part in the decisions of the Reparation Commissions, European goods must not be excluded as rigidly as under the old Protectionist's tariff systems;—all diplomatic power of the Old World's ambassadorial representation will be brought to bear against high tariffs. Europe must have our money to pay her interest to us.

Those who hope for a drastic reduction in government expense, and taxes, are doomed to disappointment. Labor is organizing to bring pressure to maintain its grip on wages and the extension of Unionized power. Government operated plants will come into disfavor and labor's efforts in that direction will fail. Huge financial problems of revenue face the Harding Administration. Deficits are already staring the Treasury in the face. Great Britain will "mix in" deeply in questions of trade, war obligations and foreign exchange. She is preparing a campaign of diplomatic pressure to stabilize our financial relations and take care of her obligations on some basis by which she will not suffer so keenly as under the present conditions. Presumably the government will not favor the housing crisis bills, nor other "Paternalistic" questions. In fact, the new Administration will mind its own business and devote itself to its functional and constitutional problems. In the mean time the people must stand by and wait.

Social Bolshevism

ONCE in a while a play comes along in which the obvious is not so apparent as to spoil the play and yet sends one away unsatisfied until the whole thought comes home. There are several kinds of Bolshevism disturbing the currents of civilization. One kind we know

about; it is thrust upon us daily; in the dispatches, in the shop and office and in political under-currents. There is another sort not so obtrusive yet equally at large in the world. It may be defined as the attempt of nouveau force to destroy that toward which it ignorantly and blunderingly gropes. It is no less Bolshevism because it is not recognizable by the trappings and mouthings of superficially educated egoism, and illy disguised self-assertion in the mask of self-determination. It is not the kind of Bolshevism that haunts the Kremlin, and struts across the Crimea, but the reaction, equally destructive to civilized expressions of living, that has come out of the war in the form of class hatred and class sabotage.

We have it in America in varied forms. It is thrust into the plastic emotions of the mentally undeveloped mass. It is skillfully sugar-coated by sensational purveyors of public information. It is brawled in halls and upon street corners by elements of our citizens who hardly speak our language and who aim to lift themselves upon the shoulders of the crowd to political preferment, or are inspired emissaries of propaganda. It is a phase, perhaps, of the evolutionary development that lies along the highway that leads from obscurity and ignorance to a certain sort of fame and a certain grade of so-called success. John Galsworthy, in his caustically termed play "The Skin Game," has portrayed the dramatics of a phase of social bolshevism in England that is equally existent over here. He has shown us the crass vulgarity, the mental dishonesty, the craven immorality of mind in the nouveau bolshevist, the raw industrialist, whom war, perhaps, has enriched and made obnoxious. The aptly named *Mr. Hornblower* of "The Skin Game," embodies the type of social sabotage that would destroy the caste, the gentility, the aristocracy, that he vainly aspires to supplant. In *Mr. Hornblower* we find the prototype of our too suddenly enriched industrialist, who seeks to accomplish in one generation what culture and refinement, nice proportions and honor acquire only through generations of breeding and the prectice of ethics in human relations.

Mr. Galsworthy has revealed the clash that is inevitable, in these after-war days of violent contrasts, when the defenceless weak cross the path of strutting power, in the hands of a man who has struggled to opulence and in savage covetousness seeks by force to ex-appropriate the position that only true gentility of mind and heart has attained.

The flower of civilization is culture, refinement and nice balance of action. It is not unattainable in a single lifetime, but it does not blossom on the product of ruthless egotism, clothed in the robes of accidental or self-gained wealth. That is one picture that Mr. Galsworthy has painted.

The greatest achievement of civilization is development of happiness in all its varied forms and expressions, and neither *Mr. Hornblower,* nor the woman of dark places, so tensely illumined by Miss Victor, as *Chloe,* who seeks it in a marriage by the short road of deceit, may wrench, by force, the cherished goal. The path up to the heights of much sneered caste is not by sabotage and social bolshevism, Mr. Galsworthy emphasizes, in "The Skin Game," nor by defying right, while attempting to displace custom, law and the longer way to more correct niceties of better social order. If there is intended a moral, social or political lesson in his play, the way for the struggler is the way that the world has long since recognized—the way seldom comprehended by those who know only the power opportunity or money success has brought, or success by sophistry and egotism reinforced by a resort to force—the way that is opened by the knowledge and practice of common human justice and right, refined in the crucible of nature in evolution into caste, class and culture.

Unfortunately for plays of the type that Mr. Galsworthy sends us, they are short-lived and are seen only in small theatres, while they should be dramatized into spectacles and presented at Hippodromes and Madison Square Gardens. However, their lesson radiates and reinforces the shaking legs of some of our mental weaklings and pessimists, and are bound to give hope that cultured minds and strong wills refuse to compromise with the madness of the Lenines and Trotskys in our social and political order.

1920 Bond Prices

Lowest of the Century

Not for 70 years have bond prices offered such opportunities for both safe and profitable investment.

High commodity prices with the ensuing low purchasing power of the dollar have brought about high interest rates. This has resulted in low bond prices although the security behind the bonds of representative corporations is greater than ever before. Noted economists believe that the upward trend has begun.

Write for list of selected bonds which offer safety, large income and opportunity for substantial increase in value.

L. L. Winkelman & Co.

62 Broad Street New York

Branch Offices in Leading Cities

Direct Wires to Various Markets

One Hundred Investment Bargains in Railroad Bonds

In a circular prepared by one of the greatest bond authorities in this country, which we have just had printed, the bond situation is not only thoroughly covered, but there is a list of one hundred bargains in high grade railroad bonds yielding as high as

Ten Per Cent

Among this list are many unusual investment opportunities, and inasmuch as underlying factors are now favorable to rising bond prices, a selection of these bonds would unquestionably result in excellent market profits, in addition to an attractive income return.

The circular will be sent without obligation, together with a booklet describing a convenient method of purchasing the bonds.

Write for Booklet FM-55

E. M. Fuller & Co.

Members Consolidated Stock Exchange of New York

50 Broad Street New York

NEW PUBLICATIONS

TITLE	AUTHOR	PUBLISHER
Alaska Man's Luck	Rutzebeck	
The Gulf of Misunderstanding	T. Pinochet	Boni & Liveright
Silent, White & Beautiful	Todd Robbins	
The Wanderer	Mary E. McAuley	Boni & Liveright
Neither Dead nor Sleeping	Mary Wright Sewall	Bobbs Merrill
Sixth Book of the Aeneid	H. E. Butler	Oxford, Basil Blackwell
The Lost Father	Arne Garborg	Stratford Co., Boston
The Twilight Soul	G. F. Mertins	Paragon Press, Montgomery, Ala.
Verd Antique	Wm. Force Stead	Oxford, Basil Blackwell
Caius Gracchus	Odin Gregory	Boni & Liveright
Contemporary French Politics	Buell	
The Imperial Orgy	Edgar Saltus	Boni & Liveright
Life of Joseph Hodges Choate (2 vols)	Edward Sanford Martin	Chas. Scribner's Sons
Our Economic and Other Problems	Otto H. Kahn	Doran
A History of Sea Power	William Oliver Stevens Allan Westcott	Doran
With the Doughboy in France	Edward Hungerford	Macmillan
The Passing Legions	George Buckanan	Macmillan
Ancient Mars	Hendrik Wm. VanLoon	Boni & Liveright
Making of the Reparations and Economic Sections of the Treaty	Bernard M. Baruch	Harper's
Greatest Failure in all History	J. Spargo	Harper's
What I Saw in Russia	Geo. Lansberry	Boni & Liveright
Outline of History	H. G. Wells	Macmillan
Money and Banking	John Thorn Holdsworth	D. Appleton & Co.
Pipefuls	Christopher Morley	Doubleday, Page & Co.
Capt. Macedoine's Daughter	William McFell	Doubleday, Page & Co.
Evolution of the Oil Industry	Victor Ross	Doubleday, Page & Co.
John Burroughs, Boy and Man	Clara Barrus, M.D.	Doubleday, Page & Co.
Taft Papers on the League of Nations	Wm. Taft	Macmillan
Introduction to History of Japan	Katsuro Hara	Putnam
The Supreme Human Tragedy	Prof. A. B. Bullock	C. W. Daniel, Ltc., London
Men and Steel	Mary H. Vorse Franklin B. Kirkbride	Boni & Liveright
The Modern Trust Company	J. E. Sterrett H. Parker Willis	Macmillan
Problems in Foreign Exchange	Martin J. Shugrue	Appleton
The Orient in Bible Times	Elihu Grant	Lippincott
The Book of Job	Morris Jastrow, Jr.	Lippincott
Seeing the Far West	John T. Faris	Lippincott

Printing

ANY man, any organization, is lucky which can call intelligently on the past for aid in solving problems of the present.

¶Our plant is complete, day and night service enables us to keep costs at a minimum.

Conway Printing Company
Lithographers, Printers and Binders
416-418 West 33rd Street, NEW YORK

DEAFNESS

THE MEGA-EAR-PHONE
A Comfortable Invisible Ear Device
Non-Irritating—Not Metal—Not Wire—Not Rubber

The Mega-Ear-Phone will restore hearing by taking the place of Perforated, Punctured, Ruptured or destroyed Natural Ear Drums. It permanently relieves Catarrhal Deafness. Stops Head Noises. It is a device giving immediate results. The scientific triumph that helps nature restore hearing, when all other efforts have failed.

The Mega-Ear-Phone will HELP YOU

Write for Booklet, describing Causes of Deafness, How and Why the Mega-Ear-Phone restores hearing.

THE MEGA-EAR-PHONE CO., Inc.
Dept. F2, Suite 722 Perry Bldg., 16th & Chestnut Sts., Phila., Pa.

Read "ZARATHUSTRAN" queer little magazine, published for odd people who do their own thinking. With other "crank" literature, and "New-Thought Era." Six months for 25c.
ATELIER TRADE SERVICE, London, Ontario

ECZEMA, PSORIASIS goitre, tetter, cancer, sore eyes, old sores, catarrh, dandruff, rheumatism, piles, St. Vitus Dance, acne, lock-jaw, barber's itch cured or no charge. Write for particulars.
ECZEMA REMEDY CO., Dept. F2, Hot Springs, Arkansas

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

HON. MILES POINDEXTER, who discusses ama tolls, has been United States Senator Washington since 1911 and is a forceful s er and writer on public affairs; ICHIRO T TOMI is founder and editor of *Kokumin S bun*, an influential daily newspaper of T and a member of the Japanese House of H He is considered one of the most brilliant ers of the present day Japan, and is a pr author in his own language; JOHN McH who outlines a plan for restoring world- perity through foreign trade, is the Vice P dent of the Mechanics and Metals Nat Bank of New York City, and Chairman o Committee on Commerce and Marine, A can Bankers Association; E. JEROME is a noted journalist, soldier, and w on musical and dramatic matters. Ca Hart, as well as serving in the recent w war, saw service in the Boer war in S Africa; HON. DANIEL F. COHALAN, who tributes in this number the first of two no articles on "Our Foreign Policy," is a York Supreme Court justice, who, for years, has taken a leading part in Democ politics. He is a member of the Catholic torical Society, Municipal Art Society of York, State Bar Association and num other organizations; GUSTAVUS MYERS specialized in historical researches and investigations and is the author of a numb important historical works; FRANK K who saw considerable service with Rough Riders in the Spanish-American is a well-known newspaper publisher of England and an accurate student of socia economic phenomena; J. B. W. GARDINE graduate of West Point Military Academy, military expert for the New York *Times* ing the War, and author of "German For the Next War"; A. L. JACKSON, a N is a graduate of Phillips Academy, And and of Harvard University, where he spe ized in English Literature, Education Soiology, and was elected class orator. has since been associated with the Int tional Committee of the Y. M. C. A. i activities in the South and Southwest, and the National Urban League; JOHN E. KEL the well-known American actor who has very successful in Shakespearean rôles, an author at four and at eight had learne violin and piano. His stage career bega *Polonius* in "Hamlet" in 1879 at King's Theatre, London. His first appearanc America was at the Boston Museum in after which he was leading man for a nu of stars, appearing also with Joseph Jeff in "The Rivals," Henrietta Crosman. Fiske, etc.; MARGUERITE WILKINSON is a quent contributor to literary and other m zines and the author of several books of and a play.